



राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश

हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य शासन द्वारा प्रकाशित

वीरवार, 20 जुलाई, 2023 / 29 आषाढ़, 1945

हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार

लोक निर्माण विभाग

अधिसूचना

शिमला-2, 18 जुलाई, 2023

सं० : पी०बी०डब्ल्यू०(बी०)एफ(5)10 / 2022.—यतः हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल को यह प्रतीत होता है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार को सरकारी व्यय पर सार्वजनिक प्रयोजन हेतु नामतः गांव बेसड़ी, तहसील रामपुर,

जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश में डकोलड़-उरु-बेसड़ी सड़क के निर्माण हेतु भूमि अर्जित करनी अपेक्षित है, अतएव एतद्वारा यह अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि उक्त परिक्षेत्र में जैसा कि निम्न विवरणी में निर्दिष्ट किया गया है, उपरोक्त प्रयोजन के लिए भूमि का अर्जन अपेक्षित है।

2. यह अधिसूचना ऐसे सभी व्यक्तियों को, जो इससे सम्बन्धित हो सकते हैं, की जानकारी के लिए भूमि अर्जन, पुनर्वास और पुनर्व्यवस्थापन में उचित प्रतिकर और पारदर्शिता अधिकार अधिनियम, 2013 (2013 का 30) की धारा-11 के उपबन्धों के अन्तर्गत जारी की जाती है।

3. पूर्वोक्त धारा द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश इस समय इस उपक्रम में कार्यरत सभी अधिकारियों, उनके कर्मचारियों और श्रमिकों को इलाके की किसी भी भूमि में प्रवेश करने और सर्वेक्षण करने तथा उप-धारा द्वारा अपेक्षित अथवा अनुमत अन्य सभी कार्यों को करने के लिए सहर्ष प्राधिकार देते हैं।

4. कोई भी हितबद्ध व्यक्ति जिसे उक्त परिक्षेत्र में कथित भूमि के अर्जन पर कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह इस अधिसूचना के प्रकाशित होने के साठ दिन की अवधि के भीतर लिखित रूप में भू-अर्जन समाहर्ता, लोक निर्माण विभाग, विन्टर फिल्ड शिमला (हि0 प्र0) के समक्ष अपनी आपत्ति दायर कर सकता है।

विवरणी

जिला	तहसील	गांव	खसरा नम्बर	क्षेत्र (है0) में
शिमला	रामपुर	बेसड़ी	297 / 1	0-00-68
			कुल जोड़	0-00-68

आदेश द्वारा,

प्रधान सचिव,
(लोक निर्माण)।

LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Dharamshala, the 24th May, 2023

No. Shram (A) 6-2/2020 (Awards).— In exercise of the powers vested under Section 17 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the publication of awards of the following cases announced by the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Kangra at Dharamshala on the website of the Printing & Stationery Department, Himachal Pradesh i.e. “e-Gazette” :—

Sr. No.	Ref. No.	Petitioner	Respondent	Date of Award/Order
1.	197/15	Rimpu Thakur	M.D. Beas Valley Power Joginder Nagar.	06-03-2023
2.	59/22	Rinku Ram	M/S Luminous Power	11-03-2023

3.	16/22	Sandeep Chand	M.D. M/S Inox Wind Ltd. Una	11-03-2023
4.	99/19	Satpal & 7 other	M.D. M/S Rangar Breweries	13-03-2023
5.	117/14	Gurdev Singh	Manager, Tervo Technologies Mandi	16-03-2023
6.	316/15	Maya Devi	Dy. Dir. Agriculture Bilaspur	17-03-2023
7.	36/22	Joginder Walia	M/S GVK Dharampur, Solan	28-03-2023
8.	237/16	Bhawana Devi	E.E.HPSEBL, Karsog	28-03-2023
9.	17/18	Raman Kant	E.E. HPPWD, Dharampur	31-03-2023
10.	517/16	Parmanand	D.F.O. Suket	31-03-2023

By order,

AKSHAY SOOD,
Secretary (Lab. & Emp.).

**IN THE COURT OF SH. HANS RAJ, PRESIDING JUDGE, LABOUR COURT-CUM-
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, KANGRA AT DHARAMSHALA (H.P.)
(CAMP AT MANDI)**

Ref. No. : 197/2015

Date of Institution : 04-5-2015

Date of Decision : 06-03-2023

Shri Rimpu Thakur s/o Shri Kundan Lal, r/o Village Aarthi, P.O. & Tehsil Joginder Nagar,
District Mandi, H.P. *Petitioner.*

Versus

The Managing Director (Project), Beas Valley Power Corporation Limited Bhatha, Joginder
Nagar, District Mandi, HP. *Respondent.*

Reference under Section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

For the petitioner : Sh. N.L. Kaundal, Ld. AR

For the respondent : Sh. R.S. Rana, Ld. Adv.

AWARD

The following reference has been received from the appropriate Government for adjudication under section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act' for short):—

“Whether termination of the services of Shri Rimpu Thakur s/o Shri Kundal Lal, r/o Village Aarhi, P.O. & Tehsil Joginder Nagar, District Mandi, H.P. w.e.f. 31-12-2012 by the Managing Director (Project), Beas Valley Power Corporation Limited Bhatha, Joginder Nagar, District Mandi, H.P., without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, is legal and justified? If not, what amount of back wages, seniority, past service benefits and compensation the above worker is entitled to from the above employer?”

2. The case of the petitioner as made out from the claim is that he was engaged as daily waged beldar against vacant post w.e.f. February 2008 without any appointment letter by the respondent through Senior Executive Engineer and he worked in the aforesaid capacity under Assistant Engineer Shri Pardeep Mehta and Junior Engineers Sh. H.K. Thakur and Sh. Ajay Gautam. He completed 240 days in each calendar year and more than 300 workmen were engaged by the respondent at that time in the same way. His services were verbally and wrongfully terminated by the Assistant Engineer w.e.f. 31.12.2012 in violation to the provisions contained in Section 25-F of the Act. More than 100 other similarly situated workmen were also terminated and new workmen were engaged in their place under political pressure. The workmen junior to the petitioner were retained and fresh hands were engaged and thus the respondent violated the provisions contained in Sections 25-G and 25-H of the Act. The petitioner was thus compelled to raise the demand by way of demand notice and when the matter was not settled, the reference was made by the appropriate Government. As per the petitioner, he was not gainfully employed anywhere since the date of his illegal termination and in these facts and circumstances the respondent be directed to reinstate the petitioner and give him the benefit of seniority, continuity in service and back wages apart from paying him litigation expenses.

3. The respondent has resisted and contested the claim and denied the case of the petitioner in toto. As per the respondent, the petitioner had never worked as a daily wage beldar and his services were never taken by the respondent at any point of time. Not even a single workman was engaged by the respondent on daily wage basis and the entire work was got conducted by engaging the services of private contractors on outsource basis. Neither the attendance register qua the petitioner was maintained at any point of time nor any payment was released directly to him. It is submitted that neither any fresh workman was engaged nor any other workman was retained as claimed. At the end, the respondent has submitted that claim was absolutely baseless, and therefore, it be dismissed.

4. The petitioner has filed rejoinder and reaffirmed the averments so made in the petition and denied those made in the reply.

5. From the pleadings of the parties and language of the reference, following issues were framed for determination on 01.12.2015:—

1. Whether termination of the services of petitioner by the respondent w.e.f. 31-12-2012 is/was improper and unjustified as alleged? .. *OPP.*
 2. If issue no.1 is proved in affirmative, to what service benefits the petitioner is entitled to? .. *OPP.*
- Relief.

6. I have heard learned Authorized Representative for the petitioner as well as learned Counsel for the respondent at length and considered the material on record.

7. For the reasons recorded hereinafter, the findings of this Court on the above issues are as under:—

Issue No.1	: No
Issue No.2	: Negative
Relief.	: Petition is dismissed per operative portion of the Award

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

ISSUES No.1 & 2

8. Both these issues are taken up together for the sake of convenience and to avoid the repetition of evidence.

9. Initial onus is upon the petitioner. He is supposed to prima-facie prove that he has worked on daily wage basis and in continuity *w.e.f.* February 2008 to 31.12.2012. The petitioner has sworn his own affidavit Ext.PW1/A which is replica of the claim petition. He has placed on the record the information received by him from the respondent through RTI as Ext.PW1/B. When the information Ext.PW1/B is carefully examined it is clear that some daily wages workmen were engaged through contractors by the respondent in the year 2013 and 2014. There is no document on the record to suggest that daily wagers were engaged by the respondent in between 2008-2011. The petitioner alleges that he had worked with several other similar situated workmen and they all were retrenched without following the process of law. The petitioner has not examined any such workman who met the similar fate. In case, hundreds of the workmen were aggrieved from the action of the respondent on termination of their services, anybody would have come forward to support the case of the petitioner and deposed on oath that he was also aggrieved in the similar manner and his services were also retrenched without following the process of law. No muster roll was tendered on the record and no mandays chart has been filed on the record. The petitioner has obtained the information under RTI from the respondent and the respondent has not supplied any muster or the mandays chart of the petitioner. The plea of respondent is that not even a single workman was engaged directly by the respondent but the work was got done through contractors and payment was made directly to the contractor. The respondent has placed on record list of the contractors engaged *w.e.f.* 2003 till date as Ext. RX. It is the case of the respondent that the petitioner must have been working as a workman under any contractor and since there was no direct relationship in between the petitioner and respondent, therefore, his services were neither engaged nor retrenched at any point of time. The specified work was allotted to the contractor and as soon as the work was completed the contract came to an end. The petitioner in his cross-examination has admitted that entire work of the construction of the project was undertaken by the private companies. In case any payment was made from the Government fund to the petitioner, the respondent was required to maintain a complete record regarding the same as the public funds can not be disbursed orally without making entries regarding the same in the cash books maintained in every public office. Had any such record been maintained by the department, the petitioner could have got the same produced before the court. The petitioner could have obtained the copy of any such document under RTI.

10. The petitioner has tried to create evidence in his favour by producing photocopy of a register claiming that it is photocopy of the attendance register where he use to mark his attendance during his engagement, but has miserably failed to prove its authenticity. It has been tendered as

Mark A. The petitioner has stated in his cross-examination that this register was maintained by Mukesh. Firstly, the existence of the original register is not established, and secondly Sh. Mukesh has not stepped in the witness-box to depose about this register. He was the best person to have replied all the questions pertaining to this register. These pages of a register show that none of the workers has signed the document to mark his presence but word “P” has been written to show the presence of the worker. This document is a suspicious document for many reasons and can not be believed. It is not clear either from the pleadings as to from where the petitioner has obtained this photocopy of the attendance register. The attendance register, if any, must be in the custody of the respondent and the respondent has not produced the same nor the extract of this register has been supplied under RTI. It is very easy for any person to purchase a printed attendance registered from the market and fill the same as per his own choice and convenience and thereafter obtain a photocopy of the same and destroyed the original. Photocopy is no evidence and marking the same as Exhibit does not prove anything in favour of the petitioner, when it appears a fabricated document on the face of it. Had the petitioner being marked as present by the respondent, it was for the petitioner to firstly explain as to from where this photocopy was obtained by him. It is clear from this register that several persons have been mentioned in the same and addition of some workmen has been made every month. The petitioner has not examined anyone among these persons named in the register in the court to prove that they were also working with the petitioner and their presence was also marked. Even it is not clear as to when this register was opened and how many pages were there in the same. There is no certificate on this register regarding number of pages at the beginning signed by a competent person. The original register was never produced. The respondent has disputed genuineness of this register.

11. The respondent has examined Shri Gaurav Sharma as RW1 who has stated on oath that the petitioner was never engaged by the respondent as a daily wage. His affidavit is Ext. RW1/A. He has specifically stated that he was never paid by the department in the capacity of workman. He was cross-examined wherein he has denied the suggestions to the contrary. There is no other evidence to support the case of the petitioner

12. Thus the petitioner has failed to prove that he was engaged as a daily wage worker by the respondent and he had worked in continuity till 2012 in such a capacity. He has also failed to prove that his services were terminated by the respondent without following the process of law. Both these issues are held in negative.

13. In view of my above discussions, the present claim petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. Parties are left to bear their own costs.

14. The reference is answered in aforesaid terms. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette. File after due completion be consigned to the Record Room.

Announced in the open Court today, this 6th day of March, 2023.

Sd/-
(Hans Raj),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal,
Kangra at Dharamshala, H.P.

BEFORE THE NATIONAL LOK ADALAT HELD AT DHARAMSHALA

[Organized by Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal, Dharamshala under Section 19 of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987 (Central Act)]

Applicant : Sh. Rinku Ram s/o Sh. Sarnu Ram,
r/o Vill. Jagat, P.O. Raunhkothi,
Tehsil Bharmour, District Chamba, H.P.

Respondent(s) : The Factory Manager, M/s Luminous
Power Technologies Private Limited
Unit-4, Gagret, Tehsil Amb,
District Una, H.P.

Number of proceedings of the
Labour Court-cum-Industrial
Tribunal, Dharamshala : 59/2022

Present:—

Applicant : Sh. Mukul Vaid, Ld. Vice Counsel

Respondents : Sh. Rajat Chaudhary, Ld. Adv.

AWARD

The dispute between the parties having been referred for determination to the National Lok Adalat and the parties having compromised/settled the case/matter, the following award is passed in terms of the settlement:

The statement of Shri Rinku Ram (petitioner) has been recorded on 21.2.2023. In view of the statement of the petitioner the matter has been settled between the parties and the petitioner does not want to pursue the case further and withdraw the same. Hence, the reference is disposed of accordingly.

Member
(B.S. Pathania)

Judicial Officer
(Hans Raj)

Announced:
Date: 11.03.2023

BEFORE THE NATIONAL LOK ADALAT HELD AT DHARAMSHALA

[Organized by Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal, Dharamshala under Section 19 of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987 (Central Act)]

Applicant : Sh. Sandeep Chand s/o Shri Bidhi
Chand, r/o Vill. & P.O. Diara, Tehsil
Amb, District Una, H.P.

Respondent(s) : The Managing Director, M/s Inox Wind Limited, Plot No.1, Khasra No.264-267, Industrial Area, VPO Basal, Tehsil & District Una, H.P.

Number of proceedings of the Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal, Dharamshala : 16/2022

Present:-

Applicant : Sh. Anuj Soni, Ld. Legal Aid Counsel

Respondent : Sh. Mukul Vaid, Ld. Adv. Vice

AWARD

The dispute between the parties having been referred for determination to the National Lok Adalat and the parties having compromised/settled the case/matter, the following award is passed in terms of the settlement:

The statement of Shri Sandeep Chand (petitioner) has been recorded on 09.3.2023. In view of the statement of the petitioner the matter has been settled between the parties and the petitioner does not want to pursue the case further and withdraw the same. Hence, the reference is disposed of accordingly.

Member
(B.S. Pathania)

Judicial Officer
(Hans Raj)

Announced:
Date: 11.03.2023

IN THE COURT OF SH. HANS RAJ, PRESIDING JUDGE, LABOUR COURT-CUM-INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, KANGRA AT DHARAMSHALA (HP)

Ref. No. : 99/2019

Date of Institution : 17.9.2019

Date of Decision : 13.3.2023

Shri Satpal & other 7 workers of the Ranger Breweries Limited Workers Union (Regd.), Ranger Breweries Limited, Industrial Area, Mehatpur, Tehsil & District Una, H.P. *Petitioners.*

Versus

The Managing Director, M/s Ranger Breweries Limited, Plot No.1 & 130, Industrial Area, Mehatpur, District Una, H.P. *Respondents.*

Reference under Section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For the petitioners : Sh. Ishant Guleria, Ld. Adv.
LRs of deceased petitioner
Sh. Ram Kumar proceeded
exparte
For the Respondent : Sh. Anubhav Walia, Ld. Adv.

AWARD

The following reference has been received from the appropriate Government for adjudication under section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act' for short):—

“Whether action of the management of M/s Ranger Breweries Limited, Plot No.1 & 130, Industrial Area, Mehatpur, Tehsil & District Una, H.P. to victimize and transfer Shri Satpal & other 7 workers of the Ranger Breweries Limited Workers Union (Regd.), Ranger Breweries Limited, Industrial Area, Mehatpur, Tehsil & District Una, H.P. in view of formation of Ranger Breweries Workers Union (registration no.1346) from the M/S Ranger Breweries Limited, Plot No.1 & 130, Industrial Area, Mehatpur, Tehsil & District Una, H.P. to Punjab and Utter Pradesh vide transfer orders dated 08-08-2017 (copies enclosed) amounts to “Unfair Labour Practices” as provided under Section 2(ra) and without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947? If yes, what relief including the cancellation of the transfer orders and other service benefits, the above aggrieved workmen are entitled to from the above management under the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947?”

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners has made the statement today in the Court to the effect that he does not want to press this reference as the reference on the same cause is already pending for adjudication and the same question can not be answered twice by the court, hence, the petitioners shall pursue the second reference only on the same point. It is submitted that the reference may be disposed of accordingly.

3. In the aforesaid background when there are neither pleadings nor evidence in support of the reference, the reference, is bound to be answered in negative. Therefore, the reference is answered in negative holding that the same reference is already pending for adjudication in this court.

4. The reference is answered in aforesaid terms. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette. File after due completion be consigned to the Record Room.

Announced in the open Court today, this 13th day of March, 2023.

Sd/-
(Hans Raj),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal,
Kangra at Dharamshala, H.P.

**IN THE COURT OF SH. HANS RAJ, PRESIDING JUDGE, LABOUR COURT-CUM-
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, KANGRA AT DHARAMSHALA (HP)
(Camp at Mandi)**

Ref. No. : 117/2014

Date of Institution : 26.2.2014

Date of Decision : 16.3.2023

Shri Gurdev Singh r/o Village Balhra, P.O. Kot, Tehsil Sarkaghat, District Mandi, H.P.
..Petitioner.

Versus

1. The Management/Employer, Tervo Technologies Limited, 101/13, Near Sadar Police Station, Paddal, District Mandi, H.P.

2. The Management/Employer, Tervo Technologies Limited, B-45, Sector-80, Noida, Phase-II, Uttar Pradesh-201301
..Respondents.

Reference under Section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

For the petitioner : Sh. Virender Kumar, Ld. Adv.

For the respondents : None for the respondents

AWARD

The following reference has been received from the appropriate Government for adjudication under section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act' for short):—

“Whether termination of services of Shri Gurdev Singh, r/o Village Balhra, P.O. Kot, Tehsil Sarkaghat, District Mandi, H.P. by the Management/Employer, in Tervo Technologies Limited, 101/13, Near Sadar Police Station, Paddal, District Mandi, H.P. (Local Address) and Management/Employer, in Tervo Technologies Limited B-45, Sector 80, Noida, Phase-II, Uttar Pradesh-201301 (Corporate Office) during September, 2012 without complying with provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, is legal and justified? If not, what amount of back wages, seniority, past service benefits and compensation the above worker is entitled from the above employer?”

1. The petitioner appeared in the very beginning and could not furnish the correct address of the Management/Employer respondent till date. Local office where the petitioner used to work before his alleged termination stands closed long back and the respondent No.1 was proceeded against exparte. The petitioner, however, could not confirm and file the address of the head office of the respondent till date.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has made the statement today in the Court to the effect that the petitioner is not interested in the matter any more as he is not willing to work outside the State, even if, the correct address of the Head office is located. It is submitted that the reference may be disposed of accordingly.

3. In the aforesaid background when there are neither pleadings nor evidence in support of the reference, the reference, is bound to be answered in negative. Therefore, the reference is answered in negative holding that the petitioner is not able to locate the permanent address of the respondent and has failed to lead the evidence in support the case.

4. The reference is answered in aforesaid terms. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette. File after due completion be consigned to the Record Room.

Announced in the open Court today, this 16th day of March, 2023.

Sd/-
(Hans Raj),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal,
Kangra at Dharamshala, H.P.

**IN THE COURT OF SH. HANS RAJ, PRESIDING JUDGE, LABOUR COURT-CUM-
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, KANGRA AT DHARAMSHALA (HP)
(Camp at Bilaspur)**

Ref. No. : 316/2015

Date of Institution : 16.7.2015

Date of Decision : 17.3.2023

Smt. Maya Devi through Shri B.S. Verma, Vice President INTUC HP State Committee,
District Bilaspur, H.P. . .Petitioner.

Versus

The Deputy Director, Agriculture Bilaspur, District Bilaspur, H.P. . .Respondent.

Reference under Section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For the petitioner : Petitioner in person with
Sh. B.S. Verma, Ld. Adv.

For the respondent : Sh. Anil Sharma, Ld. Dy. D.A.

AWARD

The following reference has been received from the “appropriate Government for adjudication under section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as ‘the Act’ for short):—

“Whether the demand of Smt. Maya Devi through Shri B.S. Verma Vice President INTUC HP State Committee, District Bilaspur, H.P. regarding her regularization since year 1997

from the Deputy Director, Agriculture Bilaspur, District Bilaspur, H.P. is justified? If yes, as a result of regularization of her services what monetary and other consequential service benefits, she is entitled to?

2. Petitioner Smt. Maya Devi has appeared in person today. She is being identified by Shri B.S. Verma her advocate. It is submitted by Smt. Maya Devi that she was regularized by the department long back and she worked thereafter as a regular employer and was ultimately retired on attaining the age of superannuation. Her statement to this effect has been recorded and she is duly identified by Shri B.S. Verma.

3. The claim was filed by the petitioner in support of the reference dated 8th July, 2015 regarding her demands for regularization as per the policies of the Government. The respondent has filed reply and resisted and contested the claim by taking several pleas which are not very relevant at this stage.

4. When the petitioner is herself not willing to pursue the matter further and she has made a statement in writing with the prayer that the matter may be closed once for all, therefore, there is no need to move ahead with the reference.

5. In view of the statement of the petitioner and in view of facts that no evidence has been led by her (petitioner) in support of her claim, claim is answered in negative holding that the petitioner has failed to lead evidence in support of the claim.

6. The reference is answered in aforesaid terms. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette. File after due completion be consigned to the Record Room.

Announced in the open Court today, this 17th day of March, 2023.

Sd/-
(Hans Raj),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal,
Kangra at Dharamshala, H.P.

IN THE COURT OF SH. HANS RAJ, PRESIDING JUDGE, LABOUR COURT-CUM-INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, KANGRA AT DHARAMSHALA (HP)

Ref No. : 36/2022
Date of Institution : 05.03.2022
Date of Decision : 28.03.2023

Shri Joginder Walia s/o Shri Nand Lal Walia, r/o Ward No.2, Dehra, Tehsil Dehra, District Kangra, H.P. . .Petitioner.

Versus

1. The Employer/Manager, M/S GVK Emergency Management Centre, Village Dharampur, Shimla Chandigarh Highway, District Solan, H.P.

2. The Programme Manager, GVK EMRI, C/O SMO, Civil Hospital, Kangra Tehsil & District Kangra, H.P. . .Respondent.

Reference under Section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For the Petitioner : None for the petitioner
For Respondent(s) : Sh. Rajat Chaudhary, Ld. Adv.

AWARD

The following reference has been received from the appropriate Government for adjudication under Section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act' for short).

“Whether the action of the employer i.e. (i) the Employer/Manager, M/S GVK Emergency Management Research Institute Emergency Management Centre, Village Dharampur, Shimla Chandigarh Highway, District Solan, H.P. (ii) the Programme Manager, GVK EMRI, C/O SMO, Civil Hospital, Kangra, Tehsil & District Kangra, H.P. to transfer Shri Joginder Walia s/o Shri Nand Lal Walia, r/o Ward No.2, Dehra, Tehsil Dehra, District Kangra, H.P. on 28-01-2020 from Dehra to Takipur, without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, is legal and justified? If not, what amount of back wages, seniority, past service benefits and compensation the above worker is entitled to from the above employer/management?”

2. It may be stated here that the notice was issued to the petitioner for 28th March, 2023 for his appearance before the court at Dharamshala which was served upon him personally. Despite of this, the petitioner did not appear before this Court. Since there are neither pleadings nor evidence in support of the reference, the reference is answered in negative. Parties are left to bear their costs.

3. The reference is answered in aforesaid terms. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette. File after due completion be consigned to the Record Room.

Announced in the open Court today, this 28th day of March, 2023.

Sd/-
(Hans Raj),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal,
Kangra at Dharamshala, H.P.

**IN THE COURT OF SH. HANS RAJ, PRESIDING JUDGE, LABOUR COURT-CUM-
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, KANGRA AT DHARAMSHALA (H.P.)
(CAMP AT MANDI)**

Ref. No. : 237/2016
Date of Institution : 21.4.2016
Date of Decision : 28.03.2023

Smt. Bhawana Devi w/o Shri Dinesh Gupta, c/o Kusum Watch Company, Bhojpur, Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, H.P. . .*Petitioner.*

Versus

The Executive Engineer, HPSEB Ltd. Division Karsog, District Mandi, H.P. . .*Respondent.*

Reference under Section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For the petitioner : Sh. N.L. Kaundal, Ld. AR

For the respondent : Sh. R.S. Rana, Ld. Adv.

AWARD

The following reference has been received from the appropriate Government for adjudication under section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act' for short):—

“Whether alleged termination of services of Smt. Bhawana Devi w/o Sh. Dinesh Gupta c/o Kusum Watch Company, Bhojpur, Sunder Nagar, Distt. Mandi, H.P. from 26.9.1984 by the Executive Engineer, H.P.S.E.B.L Division Karsog, Distt. Mandi, H.P. who had worked as Clerk on daily wages basis during 25.7.1982 to 25.9.1984 and has raised her industrial dispute vide demand notice dated 22.9.2014 after 20 years, allegedly without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is legal and justified? If not, keeping in view of working period as above and delay of 20 years in raising the industrial dispute, what amount of back wages, seniority, past service benefits and compensation the above ex-worker is entitled to from the above employer/management?”

2. The case of the petitioner, in brief, as made out in the claim to the effect that she was engaged as a daily wage clerk by the respondent w.e.f. 25.7.1982 and she worked in continuity till 25.9.1984 and for more than 240 days before her illegal termination. Compliance of Section 25-F of the Act was not made and the petitioner approached the respondent as well as other higher authorities for her reinstatement but nothing was done. She, therefore, approached the Hon'ble High Court by filing a Writ Petition No.9102 of 2012 and the respondent was directed to consider her representation. Her representation was rejected. One Smt. Sushila Thakur was engaged as daily wage clerk w.e.f. 1.8.1994 and she continued the work till 20.1.1995 and her services were also terminated and in a reference her services were ordered to be reinstated with seniority and other benefits and case of the petitioner was liable to be considered in the similar manner. The petitioner has prayed for re-engagement with all other benefits.

3. The respondent has resisted and contested the claim on the plea of maintainability and limitation. On merits, it is submitted that though the petitioner was engaged in the manner as alleged yet she had not completed 240 working days in any of the calendar year and she left the services at her own. She is alleged to have slept over her rights for years together. It is submitted that petitioner is not entitled for any relief and therefore, the petition be rejected.

4. The petitioner has filed rejoinder and reaffirmed the averments so made in the petition and denied those made in the reply.

5. From the pleadings of the parties and language of the reference, following issues were framed for determination on 17.07.2018:—

1. Whether the termination of the service of the petitioner by the respondent *w.e.f.* 26-09-1984 is/was legal and justified as alleged? . . .*OPP.*
2. If issue No.1 is proved in affirmative to what service benefits the petitioner is entitled to? . . .*OPP.*
3. Whether the claim petition is not maintainable in the present form as alleged? . . .*OPP.*
4. Whether the petitioner has no cause of action to file present case as alleged? . . .*OPP.*
5. Whether the petitioner has no locus standi to file the present case as alleged? . . .*OPP.*
6. Whether the claim petition is time barred as alleged? . . .*OPR.*
7. Whether the petitioner has not come to the court with clean hand as alleged? . . .*OPR.*
8. Whether the petitioner has suppressed true material facts from the Court as alleged? . . .*OPR.*
9. Whether the petitioner is estopped from filing the claim petition by his act and conduct as alleged? . . .*OPR.*

Relief.

6. I have heard learned Authorized Representative for the petitioner as well as learned Counsel for the respondent at length and considered the material on record.

7. For the reasons recorded hereinafter, the findings of this Court on the above issues are as under:—

Issue No.1	: No
Issue No.2	: Decided accordingly
Issue No.3	: No
Issue No.4	: No
Issue No.5	: No
Issue No.6	: No
Issue No.7	: No
Issue No.8	: No
Issue No.9	: No
Relief	: Petition is partly awarding lump sum compensation of Rs. 30,000/- per operative portion of the Award.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS*ISSUES No.1 to 5*

8. All these issues are taken up together for the sake of convenience and to avoid the repetition of evidence.

9. The mandays chart qua the petitioner has been tendered on record as Ext.RW1/B. A careful perusal of the same shows that petitioner has worked w.e.f. 26.7.1982 to 26.9.1984. She is proved to have worked for more than 240 days in the preceding 12 calendar months of her termination in the year 1984. Lastly, she has worked for 28 days through muster roll no.838. The petitioner has alleged that her services were unlawfully terminated by retaining her juniors and compliance of Section 25-F of the Act was also not made. The respondent, on the other hand, has pleaded that petitioner remained willfully absent from her work and her services were never terminated. It may be stated here that plea of willful absence is a plea of fact that a onus lies upon the employer. Willful absence of an employee is proved when an inquiry has been conducted into the reason on absence of the employee after giving him an opportunity to explain the position. Nothing has been placed by the respondent on the record to prove that the petitioner was issued any show cause notice for her absence. No material has placed on the record to prove that the petitioner was subjected to domestic inquiry on the issue of absence and she did not participate in the same or could not justify her absence. The plea of abandonment, as aforesaid, is the plea of fact and the onus is always upon the employer to establish the same. Since no material has been placed on the record by the employer to prove the willful absence of the petitioner, therefore, the plea of willful absence is not established. Since the petitioner has worked for more than 240 days in preceding 12 calendar months of her termination, it was mandatory for respondent to have called back the petitioner, in case, of her absence. Some proceedings in writing must have taken place to conclude that her absence was willful and she was no more interested in the work. Since no such material has been placed on the record the plea of willful absence is not established. The respondent has examined Engineer Sh. Sushil Kumar as RW1, and he has stated that the petitioner had herself abandoned the job. When he was subjected to cross-examination he stated that no notice was issue to the petitioner when she left the job and no explanation was ever called. He admitted that no warning was issued to the petitioner from her absence. This statement of RW1 Shri Sushil Kumar also proves that no inquiry was conducted into reason of the absence of the petitioner, and therefore, the plea of abandonment is not established. Once a plea of abandonment is not established it is proved that the respondent has violated the provisions of Section 25-F of the Act while terminating the services of the petitioner.

10. The reference received from the appropriate Government also seeks adjudication of the question of delay of 20 years in raising the industrial dispute by the petitioner. It is thus for this court to adjudicate this plea as well. The services of the petitioner were though terminated in the year 1984 she has raised the dispute after more than 20 years. It was for the petitioner to have explained the reason for such delay. The petitioner has neither explained in the petition nor in the rejoinder the reasons for not approaching the appropriate Government on time. The petitioner has appeared as PW1 in the witness box and her affidavit Ext.PW1/A also does not find any satisfactory reason for the delay. She has although tried to make out a case that her matter was not referred to the court by the appropriate Government and she had to approached the Hon'ble High Court by way of Writ Petition but she has not been able to explain as to why it took a period of 20 years to agitate the matter. When the petitioner had worked for 240 days before her termination in the year 1984 she should have raised the dispute at the earliest. The petitioner can not sleep on her rights for a period of 20 years and agitate the matter only thereafter. The delay is therefore, fatal and the petitioner at least is entitled for the relief of reinstatement. The law is settled to the effect that in case a employee sleeps over his rights for a long period, he is not entitled for reinstatement

and court well within its powers and jurisdiction to mould the relief and examine his case from a different angle in order to award him compensation. In the case in hand, taking into account the delay of more than 20 years the petitioner certainly not entitled to the relief of reinstatement but taking into the fact that she has worked for a period of 240 days before her termination in the year 1984 the ends of justice shall be met, in case, compensation of Rs.30,000/- (Thirty Thousand only) is awarded in her favour. So far as the case of one Sushila Thakur is concerned, it has its own merits and demerits and the petitioner can not claim any parity. The petition is, therefore, held as maintainable and petitioner has the locus standi as well as cause of action to file the present case and, hence all the issues are decided accordingly.

ISSUES No. 6 to 9

11. There is no limitation to make a reference to the court hence this claim is not time barred. The respondent has not led any evidence on the issue that the petitioner has come to the court with clean hand. There is nothing on the record to suggest that the petitioner has concealed the material facts from the court. There is nothing on the record which would act as estoppel against the petitioner to file the claim. Hence, all these issues are answered accordingly.

RELIEF

12. In view of my discussion on the above issues, it is held that though there had been violation of Section 25-F of the Act alone in this case and the petitioner had raised demand after a gap of more than 20 years and her claim for reinstatement has thus been vitiated by delay and laches, hence, reinstatement and other consequential benefits cannot be granted in her favour but she is held entitled for compensation to the tune of ₹30,000/- (Rupees thirty thousand only), which would be paid within four months by the respondent and from the date of receipt of Award failing which the respondent shall be liable to pay the interest @ 6% per annum on the said amount from the date of award till the date of its realization. Parties are left to bear their costs.

13. The reference is answered in aforesaid terms. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette. File after due completion be consigned to the Record Room.

Announced in the open Court today, this 28th day of March, 2023.

Sd/-
(Hans Raj),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal,
Kangra at Dharamshala, H.P.

IN THE COURT OF SH. HANS RAJ, PRESIDING JUDGE, LABOUR COURT-CUM-INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, KANGRA AT DHARAMSHALA (H.P.)

Ref No. : 17/2018
Date of Institution : 28.03.2018
Date of Decision : 31.03.2023

Shri Raman Kant s/o Shri Roshan Lal, r/o Village Tatohali, P.O. Sidhpur, Tehsil Dharampur, District Mandi, H.P. . .Petitioner.

Versus

The Executive Engineer, H.P.P.W.D. Division Dharampur, Tehsil Sarkaghat, District Mandi, H.P. . .Respondent.

Reference under Section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For the Petitioner : Shri S.K. Sharma, Ld. Adv.

For the Respondent : Shri Anil Sharma, Ld. Dy. D.A.

AWARD

The following reference has been received from the appropriate Government for adjudication under section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act' for short):—

“Whether termination of the services of Shri Raman Kant s/o Shri Roshan Lal, r/o Village Tatohali, P.O. Sidhpur, Tehsil Dharampur, District Mandi, H.P. by the Executive Engineer, H.P.P.W.D. Division, Dharampur, Tehsil Sarkaghat, District Mandi, H.P. w.e.f. 01.09.2002 without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, is legal and justified? If not, what amount of back wages, seniority, past service benefits and amount of compensation the above aggrieved worker is entitled to from the above employer?”

2. The case of the petitioner, in brief, is to the effect that he was engaged as daily rated beldar by the respondent department on 13.11.1998 and worked as such till 31.8.2002. His services were illegally terminated w.e.f. 1.9.2002 without complying with the principles of 'first come last go'. Workmen junior to the petitioner named in para no.3 of the petition were retained and regularized in the year 2008, whereas, the petitioner was not given work despite of the fact that sufficient work and funds were available. The respondent department retrenched the labourers on political basis in between 1999 to 2005 and several workmen were retrenched during this period illegally. When the petitioner requested for his reinstatement, he was put off on one or other pretext and made to believe that there were more than 1857 daily wage workers who were also retrenched and Government was taking steps to settle them. The petitioner thus kept waiting with the hope that he shall also be reinstated with all other workers but nothing was done to reinstate him. Thereafter the petitioner raised the demand but the demand was turned down and the appropriate Government refused to refer his matter for adjudication. He approach the Hon'ble High Court by way of writ petition in the year 2013 and the writ petition was dismissed. Thereafter he filed appeal before Hon'ble Supreme Court which was allowed and the appropriate Government was directed by the Hon'ble Court to refer the matter for adjudication. The petitioner further alleged that in several likewise cases, the delay has been condoned. As per the petitioner, his retrenchment was also wrong and against the provisions of the Act, and therefore, his reinstatement with all consequential benefits be ordered and claim be allowed.

3. The respondent has resisted and contested the petition and admitted that the petitioner has worked in between 1998 to 2002. The case of the respondent is to the effect that the petitioner left his job at his sweet will and his services were never terminated. The respondent admitted that some workmen were retrenched in between 1999 to 2005. It is further submitted that the petitioner has himself left the job and thus he was not entitled for any relief.

4. The petitioner filed rejoinder and re-affirmed the averments made in the petition and denied those made in the reply.

5. From the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed for determination on 09.4.2019:—

1. Whether termination of the services of petitioner by the respondent w.e.f. 01-09-2002 is/was illegal and unjustified as alleged? . . *OPP.*
2. If issue no.1 is proved in affirmative, to what service benefits the petitioner is entitled to? . . . *OPP.*
3. Whether the claim petition is not maintainable in the present form, as alleged? . . *OPR.*
4. Whether the claim petition suffers from the vice of delay and laches, as alleged? . . *OPR.*

Relief

6. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned Deputy District Attorney for the respondent at length and considered the material on record.

7. For the reasons recorded hereinafter, my findings on the aforesaid issues are as under:—

Issue No.1	: Yes
Issue No.2	: Decided accordingly
Issue No.3	: No
Issue No.4	: No
Relief	: Petition is partly allowed per operative portion of the award.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

ISSUES No.1 to 4

8. All these issues are taken up together for the sake of convenience and to avoid the repetition of evidence.

9. The respondent has admitted the case of the petitioner with respect the period during which the petitioner has worked with the respondent. Such admission is clearly made out from para no. 1 of the reply filed by the respondent. The respondent has relied upon the mandays chart of the petitioner as Ext. RW1/B. No dispute to the same has been raised by the petitioner. A careful perusal of this mandays chart reveal that petitioner has worked for 42 day in the year 1998, 315, 231 ½ and 242 days in the years 1999 to 2001. In the year 2002, he has worked for 137 days. When the number of working days in preceding twelve months before his alleged termination are counted, the same are less than 240 days. Thus the petitioner has failed to make out a case for the violation of the provision contained in section 25-F of the Act.

10. The petitioner has alleged that junior workmen to him were retained and his services were terminated by the respondent and thus the violation of the principle 'First come last go' took place. On the other hand, the respondent has set up the plea of the abandonment of the work by the petitioner. It is settled law that the plea of abandonment is a plea of fact and it is for the employer to prove the same. The petitioner has named certain workmen in para no. 3 of the petition being his juniors, who were retained by the respondent. When the evidence was led, Er. Anil Kumar Sharma (PW1) also admitted in his cross-examination that the workmen shown in the para no. 3 of the petition were juniors to the petitioner. He also admitted that the services of those workmen have been regularized in the year 2008. Thus, it is a proved fact that workmen junior to the petitioner were also available when the services of the petitioner were allegedly terminated.

11. In the aforesaid factual scenario, in case the petitioner has started absenting himself from his duties, the respondent department could not have kept silent in this situation. After all, the petitioner was governed by the provisions of the beneficial legislation and he could not have lost his valuable rights in ignorance of the law. It was the duty of the employer to have informed him of the fact that he was governed by the principle of 'First come last go' and since the workers junior to him were also working, his services could not be terminated unless workmen junior to him were terminated prior to him. It was the duty of the respondent department to have called him back, in case, he was absenting himself from the work. His explanation could have been called for. An inquiry in the reasons of his absence could have been initiated after giving him an opportunity of being heard. He could have been warned of the consequences of his absence. Sh. Anil Kumar Sharma (RW1) was subjected to cross-examination in which he stated that neither any notice was issued to the respondent nor his explanation was called for. It is thus very much clear that the respondent did not take the requisite steps at the time when the petitioner absented and has thus failed to prove that the absence of the petitioner amounted to abandonment of work. When such is the position, the respondent has failed to prove the plea of abandonment as taken up in the reply. Once such a plea fails, the plea of the petitioner that his services were terminated orally by the respondent is automatically established. It is not material whether the services of the petitioner were terminated expressly by asking him to not to come to the work or impliedly by not calling him back when he firstly started absenting himself. Once the respondent has failed to take the steps to apprise the petitioner of his rights and once the respondent has not taken the steps to call him back to work, the plea of abandonment fails and plea of termination of the services of the petitioner as taken by him is established. Moreover, the petitioner has appeared as PW1 in the witness-box and specifically stated in his affidavit Ext. PW1/A that his services were orally terminated. He has also withstood the test of cross-examination and not said anything to prove that he has abandoned his work.

12. Once the plea of abandonment as taken up by the respondent fails and it is categorically admitted by RW1 Er. Anil Kumar Sharma that several workmen junior to the petitioner were retained and regularized on their turn, the violation of the provision contained in section 25 G is established. The services of the petitioner could not have been terminated without firstly terminating the services of the junior workmen to the petitioner. In case, the petitioner was absenting himself, the respondent should have taken all the steps to establish the plea of the abandonment. Since, the respondent has failed to prove the plea of abandonment, the case of the petitioner that his services were terminated can not be disbelieved.

13. The learned Deputy District Attorney has argued on issue no.4 and stressed that the petitioner has raised the demand very late almost after 8 years and therefore, he slept over his right. According to him, the petitioner was not entitled for the relief of reinstatement or compensation as the delay has defeated everything. On the other hand, learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the delay was bonafide as the petitioner was kept in darkness by the respondent and assured that since case of several other similar situated workmen were being considered at the Government

level, therefore, there was every possibility of reinstatement of all of them. He has further argued that later on when the petitioner realized that he was being put off only then he raised the demand vide notice dated 13.8.2010 and thereafter the Government rejected the same without proper application of mind. He has further pointed out that the petitioner fought bonafide legal battle by firstly filing writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court of Himachal Pradesh and when it made dismissal he approached the Hon'ble Supreme Court by way of Civil Appeal and the Civil Appeal was allowed and the Hon'ble Court directed that the objection regarding delay be ignored and reference be made to the court. Learned counsel has referred to these facts from the reference itself.

14. It is admitted fact that the demand was raised after eight years of the termination. The question arising for consideration is whether this delay is sufficient to deny the relief of reinstatement to the petitioner or the petitioner is entitled for the relief of reinstatement or the compensation. Before this question is adjudicated, it is necessary to examine the reference received from the appropriate Government. When this reference is examined it is clear that the question of delay and laches and its effect upon the claim of the petitioner was never referred to this court for adjudication. Even the Hon'ble Supreme Court while allowing the Civil Appeal No.18012-18013 of 2017 was pleased to observe that the appropriate Government should ignore the objection of the matter of delay. The referring authority misinterpreted this observations of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and waived of this objection altogether. Otherwise, the intention of the Hon'ble Supreme Court was to the effect that the reference could be refused on the plea of delay and laches as it was for the court to examine the delay and laches while granting the relief. The appropriate Government has not referred the question of delay and laches for adjudication to this court as clear from this reference. Once reference was made by the appropriate Government in those conciliation proceedings in which the respondent department has also participated, the respondent department should have felt aggrieved by the frame of the question referred to this court for adjudication by the appropriate Government. Since the reference was not assailed therefore, the reference become final and now the respondent department can not agitate question of delay and laches by taking up the plea in the reply. Framing of issue by this court of this question is also inconsequential as it has not been referred to by the appropriate Government. A similar question has arisen before the Hon'ble High Court of Himachal Pradesh in case titled as **State of H.P & Anr. Vs. Mahinder Singh reported in 2017 LLR 1256**. The State Government of H.P had assailed the Award of the Labour court by way of writ petition on the plea that the Labour Court should have dismissed the claim petition on the ground of delay and laches as the workman had raised the dispute after a considerable time. Relying upon **Mukand Ltd. v. Mukand Staff & Officers association reported in 2004(101) FLR 219 (SC)**, it was held that the Tribunal being the creature of the Reference, can not adjudicate the matters not within the purview of the dispute actually referred to it by the order of Reference. It was further held that since the question of delay and laches was not referred to the Tribunal, therefore, the Tribunal could not have answered the Reference against the workman on the ground of delay and laches, and has thus rightly granted the relief.

15. In the aforesaid background taking the support from the aforesaid pleadings it is held that question of delay and laches has since not been referred to this court for adjudication therefore, the court can not examine the same. Otherwise also, the petitioner has specifically alleged that in between 1999 to 2005 several workers were terminated by the respondent and when the petitioner approached for the redressal of his grievance he was told that since the matter of large number of workers was pending consideration before the Government therefore, his stand shall also be considered with them. This fact is sufficient to make the petitioner to wait as he would not have annoyed the department when he was assured that everything will be in place after sometime. The petitioner could not have challenged the department as such a challenge would have harmed his future prospective. When nothing was done, the petitioner raised the demand and the delay therefore, is well explained and it can not come in the way of reinstatement of the petitioner. It is basic principle in the Industrial Disputes Act that those who come first should go last. Such

principle has to be followed strictly in the matter of termination of the services. In the present case, the principle of 'first come last go' was not followed and this fact has been proved from the material discussed hereinabove. The plea of abandonment as taken by the respondent has failed for the reason already discussed hereinabove. Since it is an admitted fact that juniors were retained and they were regularized with the passage of time thus violation of Section 25-G of the Act took place and as such the petitioner is entitled for the relief claimed.

16. The petitioner appeared as PW1 in the witness box and during the cross-examination he has stated that he had working in MNREGA during his absence and he was also working as an agriculturist. It means that the petitioner was never unemployed and he has been working in the Government schemes and earning well. When such is the position, the petitioner is held not entitled for back wages. Since the violation of Section 25-G of the Act, is established, the petitioner is held entitled for the relief of reinstatement. The petitioner is also held entitled to seniority and continuity in service as his services were terminated by the respondent for no fault on his part and the juniors to him were retained. The petitioner, is therefore, held entitled for reinstatement with seniority and continuity in service and petition is held maintainable. Hence, all the issues are held decided accordingly.

RELIEF

17. In view of my above discussions, the claim petition succeeds in part and is partly allowed. The respondent is directed to reinstate the services of the petitioner forthwith. The petitioner is entitled for seniority and continuity in service from the date of the demand notice except back wages. Parties are left to bear their costs.

18. The reference is answered in aforesaid terms. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette. File after due completion be consigned to the Record Room.

Announced in the open Court today, this 31st day of March, 2023.

Sd/-
(Hans Raj),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal,
Kangra at Dharamshala, H.P.

IN THE COURT OF SH. HANS RAJ, PRESIDING JUDGE, LABOUR COURT-CUM-INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, KANGRA AT DHARAMSHALA (HP)

Ref No. : 517/2016
Date of Institution : 23.08.2016
Date of Decision : 31.03.2023

Shri Parmanand s/o Shri Nainan Chand, r/o Village Banouni, P.O. Bhatehar, Tehsil Sarkaghat, District Mandi, H.P. . .Petitioner.

Versus

The Divisional Forest Officer, Suket Forest Division, Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, H.P.
..Respondent.

Reference under Section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For the Petitioner : Shri Rajat Chaudhary, Ld. Adv.

For the Respondent : Shri Anil Sharma, Ld. Dy. D.A.

AWARD

The following reference has been received from the appropriate Government for adjudication under section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act' for short):—

“Whether time to time termination of the service of Shri Parmanand s/o Shri Nainan Chand, r/o Village Banouni, P.O. Bhatehar, Tehsil Sarkaghat, District Mandi, H.P. during March, 1997 to year, 2012 and finally during year, 2012 by the Divisional Forest Officer, Suket Forest Division, Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, H.P., without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, is legal and justified? If not, what amount of back wages, seniority, past service benefits and compensation the above worker is entitled to from the above employer?”

2. The case of the petitioner as made out from the claim is to the effect that he was engaged in April, 1994 in Baldwara Beat by the respondent and he worked till March, 2010 and his services were unlawfully terminated while retaining the juniors shown by him in para no.3 of the claim. It is further pleaded that he approached the respondent time and again for his re-engagement but his services were never re-engaged hence, the respondent caused violation of Sections 25-B, 25-F, 25-G and 25-H of the Act. On these averments, the petitioner has prayed for his reinstatement with all consequential benefits including the seniority, back wages and continuity in service.

3. The respondent has resisted and contested the claim and denied the averments so made in the claim as incorrect. It is explained that petitioner was engaged in the year 1997 and he worked intermittently upto 2012 as per availability of work and funds and thereafter he left the work at his sweet will. Apart from this, the petitioner has never worked for 240 days in any of the calendar year and had never approached for work. It is also pointed out that he has worked with the AIRTEL Company in the year 2006 and statement to this effect has been attached with the reply. It is submitted that the claim petition be dismissed.

4. The petitioner filed rejoinder and re-affirmed the averments made in the petition and denied those made in the reply.

5. On the pleadings of the parties, following issues have been framed on 21.06.2018:—

1. Whether time to time termination of services of the petitioner by the respondent during March, 1997 to year, 2012 is/was legal and justified as alleged? *..OPP.*
2. Whether final termination of services of petitioner during year, 2012 is/was legal and justified? *..OPP.*

3. If issue no.1 or issue no.2 are proved in affirmative, to what service benefits the petitioner is entitled to? . . *OPP*.

4. Whether the claim petition is not maintainable in the present form as alleged? . . *OPR*.

5. Whether the petitioner has no locus standi to file the present claim as alleged? . . *OPR*.

Relief.

6. I have heard learned Authorized Representative/counsel for the petitioner as well as learned Deputy District Attorney for the respondent at length and considered the material on record.

7. For the reasons recorded hereinafter, my findings on the aforesaid issues are as under:—

Issue No.1 : Affirmative

Issue No.2 : Affirmative

Issue No.3 : Affirmative

Issue No.4 : No

Issue No.5 : No

Relief : Petition is **partly allowed**
per operative portion of the award.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

ISSUES No.1 and 2

8. Both these issues are taken up together for the sake of convenience and to avoid the repetition of evidence.

9. The reference received by this court is regarding time to time and final termination of the services of the petitioner in between 1997 to 2012. In other words, the case of the petitioner during conciliation proceedings was to the effect that his services were terminated time to time in between March, 1997 to the year 2012 and finally in the year 2012. When the petitioner filed the claim he alleged that he was engaged in the month of April 1994. It was thus for the petitioner to prove this plea. No documentary evidence, however, was led in support of this plea. The petitioner has himself relied upon the mandays chart obtained by him from the respondent department as Ext.PW1/B. As per this document, the petitioner was engaged in the year 1997 and he worked till 2012. He has been shown to have worked for 60 days in the year 1997. The petitioner has nowhere alleged that this Mandays chart is wrong and prepared incorrectly in order to defeat his genuine case. The petitioner has not even cross-examined the witness examined by the respondent by touching the correctness of the mandays chart. Oral evidence to the effect that petitioner was engaged in the year 1994 is not sufficient when documents do not support the same. Thus the petitioner has failed to establish that he was engaged in the year 1994. Rather, it is established on the record that he was engaged in the year 1997. It is to be remembered that Industrial Disputes Act is a beneficial piece of legislation, and therefore, the court has to construe the pleadings of the

labour generally drafted by the Authorized Representative very liberally so that the rightful claims of the workers are not frustrated on technical grounds or for the mistakes having occurred on account to the fact that pleadings have not been drafted by the legal experts. Thus the case of the petitioner can not be rejected as a whole on this ground alone. Rather, the court has to presume that the petitioner was engaged by the respondent in the year 1997 and he worked for 60 days in this particular year as is evident from the mandays chart proved on the record.

10. The petitioner has further submitted in his claim that his services were terminated in the year 2010. These averments are again wrong and contrary to the frame of the reference so received from the appropriate Government. As per the reference, the final termination of the services of the petitioner took place in the year 2012 and not in 2010. Referring the year of termination 2010 in the claim is again bonafide error having crept in the pleadings on account of the fact that the claim has been drafted by a layman and not by a professional Advocate. The case of the petitioner before the conciliation officer had been to the effect that his services were finally terminated in the year 2012. It is for this reason that the reference was received from the appropriate Government showing the year of the termination of the petitioner as 2012 and not 2010. The pleadings in the claim to the effect that the services of the petitioner were terminated in the year 2010 are again liable to be ignored and these pleadings can not be taken to defeat the valuable right of the petitioner.

11. Proceeding further with the mandays chart Ext.PW1/B, it is shown that petitioner has worked in the year 1997 for 60 days, in 1998 for 83 days, 163 days in 1999, 88 days in 2000, 71 days each in 2002 & 2003, and 81 days in 2003 and so on. He is shown to have never worked for minimum 240 days in any of the calendar year in between 1997 to 2012. During the years 2007 and 2008, he is shown to have worked for zero days.

12. In the aforesaid background, the question before this court is as to whether the petitioner was subjected to time to time termination as alleged by him or something else took place? The petitioner has alleged that he was subjected by the respondent to unfair labour practices by giving him fictional breaks, whereas, the work was given to other workers throughout the year. The respondent department met this plea in the reply and submitted that the petitioner was given work every year subject to availability of funds and work. This plea has been raised in the reply clearly and categorically. Thus as per the respondent, the petitioner was given the breaks for the reason that funds and work was not available. It is now for this court to examine the genuineness of the plea so taken by the respondent. The respondent has placed on record a seniority list of daily wage workers as it stood on 31.3.2003. This document is very material to adjudge the plea as taken by the respondent. It is pleaded case of the petitioner that he was engaged and made to work in Baldwara Beat. There is no denial on this point by the respondent. Thus this court has to examine the seniority list Ext.RW1/F carefully. It is clear from the perusal of this list that Shri Devi Ram was engaged on 1.1.1998 in Baldwara Beat and his name figures at serial no.132 in the seniority list as it stood on 31.3.2003. It means that in the year 2002 he has worked for minimum 240 days and for this reason his name was incorporated in the seniority list. It can also safely be presumed that not only in the year 2002 but in the year 1998, 1999, 2000 and 2001, this Devi Ram has worked for minimum 240 days and for this reason his name was incorporated in the seniority list of the workmen as it stood on 31.3.2003. This Devi Ram is admittedly junior to the petitioner. When this is the situation, the plea of respondent that petitioner was given work as per availability of funds and work every year is false on the face of it. In case, the work and funds had exhausted in the year 1997 to 2003 within few months of the every year, then how the worker junior to the petitioner namely Shri Devi Ram has worked for minimum 240 days every year so as to show his name in the seniority list that was prepared on 31.3.2003. In case, the work or funds were exhausted within few months every year, no work could have been offered to Shri Devi Ram in the Baldwara Beat. In case little work was available then preference should have been given to the petitioner upon

Shri Devi Ram as the petitioner was senior to him. It is not the case of the respondent that the petitioner was in the habit of absenting himself and for this reason he could not be given the work in between 1997 to 2003. The pleaded case of the respondent is the effect that the petitioner was given work as per the availability of work and funds till the year 2012. The stand of the respondent is therefore, malafide on the face of it. By giving work of minimum 240 days to Shri Devi Ram and intentionally giving the work of 60 days in the year 1997, 83 days in the year 1998, 163 days in the year 1999, 88 days in the year 2000 and 71 days each in the years 2000 to 2002 to the respondent is the malafide act on the part of the respondent. The act of the respondent is clear cut instance of unfair labour practice.

13. No document has been placed on the record by the respondent to prove that all the workmen engaged on daily wages were given work as per the availability of the work and funds every year till the year 2012. The respondent could have placed on the record any seniority list of any year after 2003 to show that no worker of the Baldwara beat has completed the work of 240 days in of the calendar year after the year 2003. It is also not the case of the respondent that no worker in this beat was regularized after the year 2003.

14. It is thus very much clear from the aforesaid discussion that petitioner was given time to time breaks on the pretext that work and fund was not available, whereas, the other workers were given work for more than 240 days each year and they were retained. As aforesaid, Shri Devi Ram was junior to the petitioner and he was retained whereas, petitioner was given work for few days in every year. The respondent has thus violated the provisions contained in Section 25-G of the Act by not giving the work to senior worker whereas, the junior workers were continued. These breaks are clear cut example of unfair labour practice and the respondent can not be permitted to exercise such practices. Had the case of the respondent been otherwise to the effect that petitioner used to absent himself from the work, position could have been different but once the respondent has come up with the specific plea that petitioner could not be given work for the whole year as there was dearth of funds and work, the petitioner is entitled for the relief under the Industrial Disputes Act as the respondent can not retained juniors over a senior as such action amounts to violation of the principle of 'first come last go'. Since the petitioner was given fictional breaks by the respondent despite of the fact that work was available and Shri Devi Ram worked throughout, therefore, fictional breaks given to the petitioner are liable to be condoned and the same are liable to be treated towards his continuity in service.

15. The respondent has tried to make out a case that in the years 2007 and 2008 the petitioner has not worked even for a single day and he was working with Airtel. One document has been placed on the record Ext.RW1/E and it is claimed to have been signed by the petitioner whereby it is mentioned that he has worked for ten months commencing from 17 March 2006 with the Airtel and he was paid Rs.2500/-. The petitioner has disputed this document and he has specifically denied the signatures over this document. Otherwise also, when the signatures made by the petitioner on the claim and statement recorded in the court are examined it is clear that he signs in English, whereas, this document is signed in Hindi. He has specifically denied that signatures on Ext.RW1/E belongs to him. Moreover, the respondent has not produced any material on the record to explain the situation when such document was prepared by the petitioner and submitted in the office. What was the need for him to him prepared a such document at all? It is thus not proved that in the years 2007 and 2008 the petitioner had voluntarily absented himself. Since it is not the plea of the respondent that petitioner used to absent himself from the work therefore, presumption of absence can otherwise also be not taken. Since the respondent has taken the plea that petitioner was given work as per availability of work and funds therefore, it has to presume that in the years 2007 and 2008 no work was given to the petitioner on the pretext that no work or funds was available, whereas, work was given to other workmen. It is clear from the mandays chart Ext.RW1/B that in the year 2009 petitioner was made to work on muster roll and he has worked for

58 days in 2009, 61 days in 2010, 30 days in 2011 and 76 days in 2012. On the one hand, the respondent has taken the plea that after the year 2009 bill system was introduced in the department and the system of muster roll was discontinued by the orders of the Government, but on the other hand the department has prepared mandays chart showing that the petitioner has worked for 58 days in 2009, 61 days in 2010, 30 days in 2011 and 76 days in 2012. It shows that the work on muster roll basis was given to the petitioner in the years 2009 to 2012 and the directions of the Government of Himachal Pradesh were flagrantly flouted. The work was given for few days so that the petitioner could not complete 240 days in any of the calendar year and claim the benefit of Section 25-F of the Act. This also instance of unfair labour practice and thus it is held that fictional breaks were given in between 1997 to 2012 to the petitioner as a matter of unfair labour practice despite of the fact that work and funds were available throughout and even Shri Devi Ram has worked till the year 2003 who was junior to the petitioner. It is also not the case of the respondent that this Devi Ram has not worked after the year 2003. The petitioner is entitled to the relief of condonation of fictional breaks given to him in between 1997 to 2012 and these shall be counted for the purpose of holding that the petitioner has worked for minimum 240 days in all these years. Had the respondent not exercised unfair labour practices upon him, such breaks would not have occasioned. Since juniors were retained and the petitioner was given fictional breaks and his services were finally terminated in the year 2012, therefore, the petitioner is entitled to the relief of reinstatement as the principle of 'first come last go' was violated by the respondent. The petitioner has specifically mentioned in para no.3 of the claim that several workmen who are junior to him were retained and regularized with the passage of time. He has reaffirmed these allegations in the affidavit sworn in his evidence. The respondent department has not specifically refuted these allegations. Shri Subhash Chand Prashar (RW1) during his cross-examination has evaded this question by deposing that he can not say orally that the workmen shown in para no.3 of the claim were junior to the petitioner and their services were regularized. When this has been case of the petitioner from very beginning it was for the officers of the respondent to make probe into these allegations, and thereafter file a complete reply with documents in support of the same in denial of the allegations. Since nothing was done by the respondent, evasive reply is not sufficient. Thus the petitioner has been successful in proving the fact that at the time of termination of his services junior workmen to him were retained and regularized. Thus for all these reasons discussed hereinabove, Issues no.1 and 2 are held in affirmative and in favour of the petitioner.

ISSUES No. 3 to 5

16. Once issues no.1 and 2 are held in affirmative the petitioner is held entitled to the relief of reinstatement as there has been violation of Section 25-G of the Act. The petitioner is held entitled for the benefit of seniority and continuity in services and it shall be presumed that he would have work for minimum 240 days each year, had he been not subjected to unfair labour practices by terminating his services and by retaining his junior. So far as back wages are concerned, the petitioner is held entitled to a lump sum of Rs.50,000/- in lieu of back wages. The petition is held maintainable and petitioner has the locus standi to file the same. Hence, issue no.3 is also decided in affirmative and issues no. 4 and 5 are decided in negative.

RELIEF

17. In view of my above discussions, the claim petition succeeds in part and is partly allowed. The fictional breaks given to the petitioner during March, 1997 to year, 2012 are held illegal having been given with the ulterior motives of not letting any right under Industrial disputes Act to accrue in favour of the petitioner. These fictional breaks are condoned and counted towards the continuity of the services. The final termination of the petitioner is also held illegal. The respondent is directed to reinstate the services of the petitioner forthwith. The petitioner is entitled for seniority and continuity in service from the date of his termination. However, the petitioner is

held entitled for Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand Only) as token money as back wages, which would be paid within four months by the respondent and from the date of receipt of Award failing which the respondent shall be liable to pay the interest @ 6% per annum on the said amount from the date of award till the date of its realization. Parties are left to bear their costs.

18. The reference is answered in aforesaid terms. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette. File after due completion be consigned to the Record Room.

Announced in the open Court today, this 31st day of March, 2023.

Sd/-
(Hans Raj),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal,
Kangra at Dharamshala, H.P.

FINANCE (REGULATIONS) DEPARTMENT

RESOLUTION

Shimla-171002, the 17th July, 2023.

No. Fin.(C)A(3)-13/2016.—It is announced for general information that during the year 2023-2024, accumulations at the credit of subscribers to the General Provident Fund and other similar funds shall carry interest at the rate of 7.1 % (seven point one percent) w. e. f. 1st April, 2023 to 30th June, 2023.

Ordered that Resolution be published in Gazette of Himachal Pradesh.

By order,
AKSHAY SOOD,
Secretary (Finance).

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी एवं नायब तहसीलदार, भलेई,
जिला चम्बा (हि0प्र0)

श्री तिलक राज पुत्र हुशियारा, निवासी गांव कुफलीयाणी, परगना व उप-तहसील भलेई, जिला चम्बा (हि0प्र0) प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता फरीकदोयम।
प्रार्थना—पत्र बाबत नाम दुरुस्ती जेर धारा 38(2) हि0 प्र0 भू-राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 के अन्तर्गत करने बारे।

प्रार्थी श्री तिलक राज पुत्र हुशियारा, निवासी गांव कुफलीयाणी, परगना व उप-तहसील भलेई, जिला चम्बा (हि0प्र0) ने निवेदन किया है कि आवेदक का नाम ग्राम पंचायत औहरा के परिवार रिकार्ड में तिलक राज सही व दुरुस्त दर्ज है लेकिन राजस्व अभिलेख महाल कुफलीयाणी व संराई में प्रार्थी का नाम तिलक दर्ज है जोकि गलत दर्ज है। जिसे प्रार्थी उपरोक्त अभिलेख के अनुसार तिलक की बजाये तिलक राज पुत्र हुशियारा दुरुस्त करवाना चाहता है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार के माध्यम से सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को प्रार्थी उक्त का नाम दुरुस्त करने बारा कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 27-07-2023 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे असागतन या वकालतन हाजिर होकर अपना उजर व एतराज लिखित रूप में पेश करें अन्यथा प्रार्थी का नाम दुरुस्त करने बारा आदेश पारित कर दिये जायेंगे। इसके उपरान्त कोई भी उजर व एतराज काबिले समागत न होगा।

आज दिनांक 27-06-2023 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
भलेई, जिला चम्बा (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत श्री सीता राम, नायब तहसीलदार व कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, उप-तहसील तेलका,
जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मिसल नं0 : 06 ना0 तह0 वाचक उप-तहसील तेलका/2022-370-71

तारीख दायरा : 03-10-2022

कालू राम पुत्र श्री दमोदर, गांव कुलहाला, डाकघर टिकरू, परगना जुंड, उप-तहसील तेलका, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश वादी।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादी।

विषय.—राजस्व कागजात माल में नाम दुरुस्ती करने बारे प्रार्थना-पत्र।

कालू राम पुत्र श्री दमोदर, गांव कुलहाला, डाकघर टिकरू, परगना जुंड, उप-तहसील तेलका, जिला चम्बा, ने इस अदालत में एक आवेदन-पत्र व ब्यान हल्फी पेश किया है कि मेरा नाम परिवार रजिस्टर नकल, आधार कार्ड व पेन कार्ड में कालू राम दर्ज है जो बिल्कुल सही व दुरुस्त है परन्तु राजस्व अभिलेख मुहाल डोल, पटवार वृत्त लिग्गा, उप-तहसील तेलका में मेरा नाम निर्मल दर्ज है जो गलत है।

अतः प्रार्थी का ब्यान हल्फी स्वीकार करते हुए इस इशतहार/मुस्त्री मुनादी व चस्पांगी द्वारा आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को प्रार्थी के नाम का इन्द्राज करने बारा किसी प्रकार का कोई उजर एवं एतराज हो तो वह असागतन व वकालतन इस इशतहार के प्रकाशन की तिथि उपरान्त एक माह के भीतर अपना उजर एवं एतराज पेश कर सकते हैं। बाद तारीख किसी किस्म का उजर एवं एतराज नहीं सुना जाएगा व उक्त प्रार्थी का नाम निर्मल के बजाए कालू राम दर्ज करने के आदेश पटवारी, पटवार वृत्त लिग्गा को पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

यह इशतहार मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से आज दिनांक 30-06-2023 को जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित / —
नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
उप-तहसील तेलका, जिला चम्बा (हि0प्र0)।

**In the Court of Sh. Rakesh Kumar Sharma, H.A.S., Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional
Magistrate, Sujanpur, Distt. Hamirpur (H. P.)**

In the matter of :

1. Sandeep Kumar age 36 years s/o Bidhi Chand, r/o Village Jol, P.O. Bir Bagehra, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

2. Sima Shaibya age 27 years d/o Bimal Shaibya, r/o Village Talukjote, P.O. Nimya, Tehsil Matigara, Distt. Darjeeling (W.B.) .. *Applicants.*

Versus

The General Public

.. *Respondent.*

Application for the registration of marriage under section 16 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 (Central Act) as amended by Marriage Laws (Amendment Act 01, 49 of 2001).

Sandeep Kumar age 36 years s/o Bidhi Chand, r/o Village Jol, P.O. Bir Bagehra, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.) and Sima Shaibya age 27 years d/o Bimal Shaibya, r/o Village Talukjote, P.O. Nimya, Tehsil Matigara, Distt. Darjeeling (W.B.) have filed an application alongwith affidavits in this court under section 16 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 (Central Act) as amended by the Marriage Laws (Amendment Act 01, 49 of 2001) that they have solemnized their marriage ceremony on 01-05-2023 at Village Jol, P.O. Bir Bagehra, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.) as per Hindu Rites and Customs and they are living together as husband and wife since then. Hence their marriage may be registered under Special Marriage Act, 1954.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that any person who has any objections regarding this marriage can file the objections personally or in writing before this court on or before 28-07-2023. After that no objections will be entertained and marriage will be registered accordingly.

Issued today on 28-06-2023 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal.

Sd/-
Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Sujanpur, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.).

In the Court of Sh. Rakesh Kumar Sharma, H.A.S., Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Sujanpur, Distt. Hamirpur (H. P.)

In the matter of :

1. Subhash Chand age 49 years s/o M.R. Rana, r/o Village Tamloh, P.O. Palampur, Tehsil Palampur, District Kangra (H.P.).

2. Maya Devi age 37 years d/o Manohar Chand, r/o Village Mayanan, P.O. Bhaleth, Tehsil Sujanpur, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.) .. *Applicants.*

Versus

The General Public

.. *Respondent.*

Application for the registration of marriage under section 16 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 (Central Act) as amended by Marriage Laws (Amendment Act 01, 49 of 2001).

Subhash Chand age 49 years s/o M.R. Rana, r/o Village Tamloh, P.O. Palampur, Tehsil Palampur, District Kangra (H.P.) and Maya Devi age 37 years d/o Manohar Chand, r/o Village Mayanan, P.O. Bhaleth, Tehsil Sujanpur, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.) have filed an application alongwith affidavits in this court under section 16 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 (Central Act) as amended by the Marriage Laws (Amendment Act 01, 49 of 2001) that they have solemnized their marriage ceremony on 12-07-2023 at Baba Sardha Sidh Bhakti Mandir and Ashram, Tanda Rajpur, District Kangra (H.P.) as per Hindu Rites and Customs and they are living together as husband and wife since then. Hence their marriage may be registered under Special Marriage Act, 1954.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that any person who has any objections regarding this marriage can file the objections personally or in writing before this court on or before 28-07-2023. After that no objections will be entertained and marriage will be registered accordingly.

Issued today on 28-06-2023 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal.

Sd/-

*Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Sujanpur, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.).*

In the Court of Sh. Rakesh Kumar Sharma, H.A.S., Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Sujanpur, Distt. Hamirpur (H. P.)

In the matter of :

1. Surinder age 35 years s/o Puran Chand, r/o Village Sundrada, P.O. Charot, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

2. Esha Das age 25 years d/o Ratan Das, r/o V.P.O. Chumkedima Dimapur, Nagaland .. *Applicants.*

Versus

The General Public

.. Respondent.

Application for the registration of marriage under section 16 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 (Central Act) as amended by Marriage Laws (Amendment Act 01, 49 of 2001).

Surinder age 35 years s/o Puran Chand, r/o Village Sundrada, P.O. Charot, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.) and Esha Das age 25 years d/o Ratan Das, r/o V.P.O. Chumkedima Dimapur, Nagaland have filed an application alongwith affidavits in this court under section 16 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 (Central Act) as amended by the Marriage Laws (Amendment Act 01, 49 of 2001) that they have solemnized their marriage ceremony on 01-11-2022 at Village Sundrada, P.O. Charot, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.) as per Hindu Rites and Customs and they are living together as husband and wife since then. Hence their marriage may be registered under Special Marriage Act, 1954.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that any person who has any objections regarding this marriage can file the objections personally or in writing before this court on or before 28-07-2023. After that no objections will be entertained and marriage will be registered accordingly.

Issued today on 28-06-2023 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal.

Sd/-

*Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Sujanpur, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.).*

In the Court of Sh. Rakesh Kumar Sharma, H.A.S., Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Sujanpur, Distt. Hamirpur (H. P.)

In the matter of :

1. Sunny Thakur age 32 years s/o Late Sh. Gian Chand, r/o V.P.O. Thana, P.O. Thana, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

2. Kavita age 27 years d/o Prem Singh, r/o V.P.O. Chaloha, Tehsil & Distt. Una (H.P.)

.. Applicants.

Versus

The General Public

.. Respondent.

Application for the registration of marriage under section 16 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 (Central Act) as amended by Marriage Laws (Amendment Act 01, 49 of 2001).

Sunny Thakur age 32 years s/o Late Sh. Gian Chand, r/o V.P.O. Thana, P.O. Thana, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.) and Kavita age 27 years d/o Prem Singh, r/o V.P.O. Chaloha, Tehsil & Distt. Una (H.P.) have filed an application alongwith affidavits in this court under section 16 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 (Central Act) as amended by the Marriage Laws (Amendment Act 01, 49 of 2001) that they have solemnized their marriage ceremony on 07-11-2021 at V.P.O. Chaloha, Tehsil & Distt. Una (H.P.) as per Hindu Rites and Customs and they are living together as husband and wife since then. Hence their marriage may be registered under Special Marriage Act, 1954.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that any person who has any objections regarding this marriage can file the objections personally or in writing before this court on or before 28-07-2023. After that no objections will be entertained and marriage will be registered accordingly.

Issued today on 28-06-2023 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal.

Sd/-

*Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Sujanpur, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.).*

**In the Court of Sh. Rakesh Kumar Sharma, H.A.S., Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional
Magistrate, Sujanpur, Distt. Hamirpur (H. P.)**

In the matter of :

1. Sapan Kumar age 42 years s/o Late Sh. Subhash Chand, r/o Ward No. 5, Radha Swami Mohalla, P.O. Sujanpur, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

2. Manjula Dogra age 41 years d/o Roshan Lal Dogra, r/o House No. HE-1134, Phase 1 Mohali, Chandigarh, Sector 55 S.A.S. Nagar, Mohali Punjab-160055 .. *Applicants.*

Versus

The General Public

.. *Respondent.*

Application for the registration of marriage under section 16 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 (Central Act) as amended by Marriage Laws (Amendment Act 01, 49 of 2001).

Sapan Kumar age 42 years s/o Late Sh. Subhash Chand, r/o Ward No. 5, Radha Swami Mohalla, P.O. Sujanpur, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.) and Manjula Dogra age 41 years d/o Roshan Lal Dogra, r/o House No. HE-1134, Phase 1 Mohali, Chandigarh, Sector 55 S.A.S. Nagar, Mohali Punjab-160055 have filed an application alongwith affidavits in this court under section 16 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 (Central Act) as amended by the Marriage Laws (Amendment Act 01, 49 of 2001) that they have solemnized their marriage ceremony on 30-01-2015 at Hotel Sagar (Near Sainik School Sujanpur, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.) as per Hindu Rites and Customs and they are living together as husband and wife since then. Hence their marriage may be registered under Special Marriage Act, 1954.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that any person who has any objections regarding this marriage can file the objections personally or in writing before this court on or before 28-07-2023. After that no objections will be entertained and marriage will be registered accordingly.

Issued today on 28-06-2023 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal.

Sd/-

*Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Sujanpur, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.).*

**In the Court of Sh. Manish Kumar Soni H.A.S. Sub-Divisional Magistrate-cum-Additional
District Registrar of Marriage, Sub-Division Hamirpur (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

1. Sh. Dhiraj Jaswal s/o Sh. Rikhi Ram, r/o Village Ropa, P.O. Nalti, Tehsil & District Hamirpur (H.P.).

2. Smt. Jyoti d/o Sh. Anil Sharma, r/o Village Palsan, P.O. Nalti, Tehsil & District Hamirpur (H.P.) .. Applicants.

Versus

General Public

Subject.— Registration of marriage under section 8 (3) of the Himachal Pradesh Registration of Marriage Act, 1996

WHEREAS, an application under section 8 (3) of Himachal Pradesh Registration of Marriage Act, 1996 has been received from Sh. Dhiraj Jaswal and Smt. Jyoti alongwith documents and affidavits stating therein that they have solemnized their marriage on 23-02-2023 and same could not be registered, under the act *ibid* in the office of the Local Registrar Marriage-cum-Secretary Gram Panchayat Jangal Ropa, Development Block Hamirpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.) within Stipulated Period due to unavoidable cricumstances.

NOW THEREFORE, the General Public is hereby informed through this notice that if any person having any objection regarding registration of this marriage, may file his/her objections personally or in writing before this court on or before 11-08-2023. In case no objection is received by 11-08-2023, it will be presumed that there is no objection to the registration of the above said marriage and the same will be registered accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on 10-07-2023.

Seal.

Sd/-

*Sub-Divisional Magistrate-cum-
Additional District Registrar of Marriage,
Sub-Division Hamirpur (H.P.).*

**In the Court of Sh. Manish Kumar Soni H.A.S. Sub-Divisional Magistrate-cum-Additional
District Registrar of Marriage, Sub-Division Hamirpur (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

1. Sh. Sanjeev Kumar s/o Sh. Shakti Chand, r/o Village Siswan, P.O. Bari Mandir, Tehsil Bamson at Tauni Devi, District Hamirpur (H.P.)-177023.

2. Smt. Anchal d/o Sh. Pawan Kumar, r/o Village & P.O. Tajewala, Tehsil & District Yamuna Nagar, Haryana-135106 .. Applicants.

Versus

General Public

Subject.— Registration of marriage under section 8 (3) of the Himachal Pradesh Registration of Marriage Act, 1996

WHEREAS, an application under section 8 (3) of Himachal Pradesh Registration of Marriage Act, 1996 has been received from Sh. Sanjeev Kumar and Smt. Anchal alongwith documents and affidavits stating therein that they have solemnized their marriage on dated 12-12-2022 and same could not be registered, under the act *ibid* in the office of the Local Registrar Marriage-cum-Secretary Gram Panchayat Sikander, Development Block Bamson at Tauni Devi, District Hamirpur (H.P.) within Stipulated Period due to unavoidable circumstances.

NOW THEREFORE, the General Public is hereby informed through this notice that if any person having any objection regarding registration of this marriage, may file his/her objections personally or in writing before this court on or before 21-08-2023. In case no objection is received by 21-08-2023, it will be presumed that there is no objection to the registration of the above said marriage and the same will be registered accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on 10-07-2023.

Seal.

Sd/-

*Sub-Divisional Magistrate-cum-
Additional District Registrar of Marriage,
Sub-Division Hamirpur (H.P.).*

In the Court of Sh. Manish Kumar Soni, HPAS, Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Hamirpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.)

In the matter of :

1. Sh. Kebal Krishan s/o Shri Gajan Singh, r/o Village Thalakna, P.O. Jol Lambri, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.)-176111.

2. Smt. Kajal Kumari d/o Sh. Hoshiyar Singh, r/o Village & P.O. Jassaur Garh, Tehsil Churah, Distt. Chamba (H.P.)-176321 .. Applicants.

Versus

General Public

Subject.— Notice of Intended Marriage.

Sh. Kibal Krishan & Smt. Kajal Kumari have filed an application U/S 5 of Special Marriages Act, 1954 alongwith affidavits and supporting documents in the court of undersigned, in which they have stated that they intend to solemnize their marriage within next three calendar months.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that if any person having any objection regarding this marriage may file his/her objections personally or in writing before this court on or before 16-08-2023. In case no objection is received by 16-08-2023, it will be presumed that there is no objection to the registration of the above said marriage and the same will be registered accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on 10-07-2023.

Seal.

Sd/-

*Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Sub-Division Hamirpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.).*

**ब अदालत तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, तहसील धीरा,
जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)**

केस नं0 : 13/Teh/2022

किस्म मुकद्दमा : तकसीम

तारीख पेशी : 07-08-2023

शीर्षक : प्रकाश चन्द आदि

बनाम

अनुरुद्ध कुमार आदि

Proclamation/Munadi U/s 23.

मुकद्दमा.—तकसीम जेर धारा 123 हि0 प्र0 भू-राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 बाबत भूमि खाता नं0 7, खतौनी नं0 9, खसरा नं0 122, रकबा तादादी 0-16-60 है0 स्थित महाल पंजियाल, मौजा पुढ़वा, तहसील धीरा, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

इस अदालत में प्रकाश चन्द पुत्र दुर्गा राम व संजूवाला पत्नी स्व0 प्रदीप कुमार आदि (वादीगण) ने जेर धारा 123 हि0 प्र0 भू-राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 के तहत उपरोक्त खाता की तकसीम किए जाने सम्बन्धी मुकद्दमा दायर किया है जिसमें प्रतिवादीगण 1. अनुरुद्ध कुमार पुत्र प्रीतम चन्द, 2. विनोद कुमार पुत्र प्रीतम चन्द, 3. सुजाता कुमारी पुत्री प्रीतम चन्द, 4. ओम प्रकाश पुत्र दुर्गा सिंह, 5. संजय कुमार पुत्र दुर्गा सिंह, 6. उत्तम चन्द पुत्र साहव सिंह, 7. अनूप कुमार पुत्र उत्तम चन्द, 8. अशनूप कुमार पुत्र उत्तम चन्द, 9. किरन कुमार पुत्र उत्तम चन्द, 10. सुरेश कुमार पुत्र महाताव सिंह, 11. विमल किशोर पुत्र महाताव सिंह, 12. स्वर्णा देवी पुत्री महाताव सिंह, 13. मुनीशा कुमारी पुत्री महाताव सिंह, 14. रजत राणा पुत्र प्रदीप कुमार, 15. कुमारी शिवानी पुत्री प्रदीप कुमार सभी निवासी महाल पुढ़वा, तहसील धीरा, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) की तामील नियमानुसार समन साधारण तरीके से करवाई जा चुकी है लेकिन रिपोर्ट तामील कुनिंदा अनुसार प्रतिवादी नं0 7, अनूप कुमार कई वर्षों से लापता है, नं0 8 अशनूप कुमार आर्मी में सर्विस करता है, नं0 9 किरन कुमार व प्रतिवादी नं0 12 स्वर्णा देवी का सही पता उपलब्ध करवाने में वादी प्रकाश चन्द ने असमर्थता जाहिर की है तथा इनकी तामील राजपत्र इश्तहार व मुनादी द्वारा करवाने हेतु प्रार्थना-पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है।

अतः उपरोक्त वर्णित प्रतिवादीगण को राजपत्र इश्तहार हि0प्र0/मुनादी के द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि वह उक्त तकसीम में अपना पक्ष रखना चाहते हैं तो वह दिनांक 07-08-2023 को प्रातः 10.30 बजे

असालतन या वकालतन इस अदालत में हाजिर हों अन्यथा उनके खिलाफ एकतरफा कार्यवाई अमल में लाई जायेगी।

आज दिनांक 30-06-2023 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—

तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
तहसील धीरा, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

**ब अदालत तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, तहसील धीरा,
जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)**

केस नं0 : 12/Teh/2022

किस्म मुकद्दमा : तकसीम

तारीख पेशी : 07-08-2023

शीर्षक : प्रकाश चन्द आदि

बनाम

अनुरुद्ध कुमार आदि

Proclamation/Munadi U/s 23.

मुकद्दमा.—तकसीम जेर धारा 123 हि0 प्र0 भू-राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 बाबत भूमि खाता नं0 11, खतौनी नं0 13, खसरा कित्ता 03, रकबा तादादी 00-56-32 है0 स्थित महाल सनवाड़, मौजा पुढ़वा, तहसील धीरा, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

इस अदालत में प्रकाश चन्द पुत्र दुर्गा राम व संजूवाला पत्नी स्व0 प्रदीप कुमार आदि (वादीगण) ने जेर धारा 123 हि0 प्र0 भू-राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 के तहत उपरोक्त खाता की तकसीम किए जाने सम्बन्धी मुकद्दमा दायर किया है जिसमें प्रतिवादीगण 1. अनुरुद्ध कुमार पुत्र प्रीतम चन्द, 2. विनोद कुमार पुत्र प्रीतम चन्द, 3. सुजाता कुमारी पुत्री प्रीतम चन्द, 4. ओम प्रकाश पुत्र दुर्गा सिंह, 5. संजय कुमार पुत्र दुर्गा सिंह, 6. सुरेश कुमार पुत्र महाताव सिंह, 7. विमल किशोर पुत्र महाताव सिंह, 8. रजत राणा पुत्र प्रदीप कुमार, 9. कुमारी शिवानी पुत्री प्रदीप कुमार, 10. रामा शंकर पुत्र जौंकी, 11. रमेश चन्द पुत्र जौंकी सभी निवासी महाल पुढ़वा, तहसील धीरा, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) की तामील नियमानुसार समन जारी करके की जा चुकी है लेकिन वादी प्रकाश चन्द ने प्रतिवादी नं0 विनोद कुमार पुत्र प्रीतम चन्द का सही पता उपलब्ध करवाने में असमर्थता जाहिर की है।

अतः प्रतिवादी नं0 2 विनोद कुमार पुत्र प्रीतम चन्द को राजपत्र इश्तहार हि0प्र0/मुनादी के द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि वह उक्त तकसीम में अपना पक्ष रखना चाहते हैं तो इस नोटिस के जारी होने की तिथि से एक माह के भीतर या दिनांक 07-08-2023 को प्रातः 10.30 बजे असालतन या वकालतन इस अदालत में हाजिर हों अन्यथा उनके खिलाफ एकतरफा कार्यवाई अमल में लाई जायेगी।

आज दिनांक 30-06-2023 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—

तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
तहसील धीरा, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

**ब अदालत तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, तहसील धीरा,
जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)**

केस नं0 : 11/Teh/2022

किस्म मुकद्दमा : तकसीम

तारीख पेशी : 07-08-2023

शीर्षक : प्रकाश चन्द आदि

बनाम

अनुरुद्ध कुमार आदि

Proclamation/Munadi U/s 23.

मुकद्दमा.—तकसीम जेर धारा 123 हि० प्र० भू-राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 बाबत भूमि खाता नं० 2, खतौनी नं० 2, खसरा नं० 567/1, रकबा तादादी 00-13-76 है० स्थित महाल पंजियाल, मौजा पुढ़वा, तहसील धीरा, जिला कांगड़ा (हि०प्र०)।

इस अदालत में प्रकाश चन्द पुत्र दुर्गा राम व संजूवाला पत्नी स्व० प्रदीप कुमार आदि (वादीगण) ने जेर धारा 123 हि० प्र० भू-राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 के तहत उपरोक्त खाता की तकसीम किए जाने सम्बन्धी मुकद्दमा दायर किया है जिसमें प्रतिवादीगण 1. अनुरुद्ध कुमार पुत्र प्रीतम चन्द, 2. विनोद कुमार पुत्र प्रीतम चन्द, 3. सुजाता कुमारी पुत्री प्रीतम चन्द, 4. ओम प्रकाश पुत्र दुर्गा सिंह, 5. संजय कुमार पुत्र दुर्गा सिंह, 6. उत्तम चन्द पुत्र साहव सिंह, 7. अनूप कुमार पुत्र उत्तम चन्द, 8. अशनूप कुमार पुत्र उत्तम चन्द, 9. किरन कुमार पुत्र उत्तम चन्द, 10. सुरेश कुमार पुत्र महाताव सिंह, 11. विमल किशोर पुत्र महाताव सिंह, 12. स्वर्णा देवी पुत्री महाताव सिंह, 13. मुनीशा कुमारी पुत्री महाताव सिंह, 14. रजत राणा पुत्र प्रदीप कुमार, 15. कुमारी शिवानी पुत्री प्रदीप कुमार, सभी निवासी महाल पुढ़वा, तहसील धीरा, जिला कांगड़ा (हि०प्र०) की तामील नियमानुसार समन साधारण तरीके से करवाई जा चुकी है लेकिन रिपोर्ट तामील कुनिंदा अनुसार प्रतिवादी नं० 7 अनूप कुमार कई वर्षों से लापता है, नं० 8 अशनूप कुमार आर्मी में सर्विस करता है, नं० 9 किरन कुमार व प्रतिवादी नं० 12 स्वर्णा देवी का सही पता उपलब्ध करवाने में वादी प्रकाश चन्द ने असमर्थता जाहिर की है तथा इनकी तामील राजपत्र इश्तहार व मुनादी द्वारा करवाने हेतु प्रार्थना-पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है।

अतः उपरोक्त वर्णित प्रतिवादीगण को राजपत्र इश्तहार हि०प्र०/मुनादी के द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि वह उक्त तकसीम में अपना पक्ष रखना चाहते हैं तो वह दिनांक 07-08-2023 को प्रातः 10.30 बजे अदालतन या वकालतन इस अदालत में हाजिर हों अन्यथा उनके खिलाफ एकतरफा कार्यवाई अमल में लाई जायेगी।

आज दिनांक 30-06-2023 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
तहसील धीरा, जिला कांगड़ा (हि०प्र०)।

ब अदालत तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, तहसील धीरा,
जिला कांगड़ा (हि०प्र०)

केस नं० : 10/Teh/2022

किस्म मुकद्दमा : तकसीम

तारीख पेशी : 07-08-2023

शीर्षक : प्रकाश चन्द आदि

बनाम

अनुरुद्ध कुमार आदि

Proclamation/Munadi U/s 23.

मुकद्दमा.—तकसीम जेर धारा 123 हि० प्र० भू-राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 बाबत भूमि खाता नं० 10, खतौनी नं० 12, खसरा कित्ता 04, रकबा तादादी 00-04-62 है० स्थित महाल सनवाड़, मौजा पुढ़वा, तहसील धीरा, जिला कांगड़ा (हि०प्र०)।

इस अदालत में प्रकाश चन्द पुत्र दुर्गा राम व संजूवाला पत्नी स्व० प्रदीप कुमार आदि (वादीगण) ने जेर धारा 123 हि० प्र० भू-राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 के तहत उपरोक्त खाता की तकसीम किए जाने सम्बन्धी मुकद्दमा दायर किया है जिसमें प्रतिवादीगण 1. अनुरुद्ध कुमार पुत्र प्रीतम चन्द, 2. विनोद कुमार पुत्र प्रीतम

चन्द, 3. सुजाता कुमारी पुत्री प्रीतम चन्द, 4. ओम प्रकाश पुत्र दुर्गा सिंह, 5. संजय कुमार पुत्र दुर्गा सिंह, 6. उत्तम चन्द पुत्र साहव सिंह, 7. अनूप कुमार पुत्र उत्तम चन्द, 8. अशनूप कुमार पुत्र उत्तम चन्द, 9. किरन कुमार पुत्र उत्तम चन्द, 10. रजत राणा पुत्र प्रदीप कुमार, 11. कुमारी शिवानी पुत्री प्रदीप कुमार 12. सुरेश कुमार पुत्र महाताव सिंह, 13. विमल किशोर पुत्र महाताव सिंह, 14. स्वर्णा देवी पुत्री महाताव सिंह, सभी निवासी महाल पुड़वा, तहसील धीरा, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) की तामील नियमानुसार समन साधारण तरीके से करवाई जा चुकी है लेकिन रिपोर्ट तामील कुनिंदा अनुसार प्रतिवादी नं0 7 अनूप कुमार कई वर्षों से लापता है, नं0 8 अशनूप कुमार आर्मी में सर्विस करता है, नं0 9 किरन कुमार पुत्र महाताव सिंह का सही पता उपलब्ध करवाने में वादी प्रकाश चन्द ने असमर्थता जाहिर की है तथा इनकी तामील राजपत्र इश्तहार व मुनादी द्वारा करवाने हेतु प्रार्थना-पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है।

अतः उपरोक्त वर्णित प्रतिवादीगण को राजपत्र इश्तहार हि0प्र0/मुनादी के द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि वह उक्त तकसीम में अपना पक्ष रखना चाहते हैं तो वह दिनांक 07-08-2023 को प्रातः 10.30 बजे असालतन या वकालतन इस अदालत में हाजिर हों अन्यथा उनके खिलाफ एकतरफा कार्यवाई अमल में लाई जायेगी।

आज दिनांक 30-06-2023 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
तहसील धीरा, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

**ब अदालत तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, तहसील धीरा,
जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)**

केस नं0 : 09/Teh/2022

किस्म मुकद्दमा : तकसीम

तारीख पेशी : 07-08-2023

शीर्षक : प्रकाश चन्द आदि

बनाम

अनुरुद्ध कुमार आदि

Proclamation/Munadi U/s 23.

मुकद्दमा.—तकसीम जेर धारा 123 हि0 प्र0 भू-राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 बाबत भूमि खाता नं0 12, खतौनी नं0 14, ता 15, खसरा कित्ता 02, रकबा तादादी 00-19-13 है0 स्थित महाल सनवाड़, मौजा पुड़वा, तहसील धीरा, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

इस अदालत में प्रकाश चन्द पुत्र दुर्गा राम व संजूवाला पत्नी स्व0 प्रदीप कुमार आदि (वादीगण) ने जेर धारा 123 हि0 प्र0 भू-राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 के तहत उपरोक्त खाता की तकसीम किए जाने सम्बन्धी मुकद्दमा दायर किया है जिसमें प्रतिवादीगण 1. अनुरुद्ध कुमार पुत्र प्रीतम चन्द, 2. विनोद कुमार पुत्र प्रीतम चन्द, 3. सुजाता कुमारी पुत्री प्रीतम चन्द, 4. ओम प्रकाश पुत्र दुर्गा सिंह, 5. संजय कुमार पुत्र दुर्गा सिंह, 6. उत्तम चन्द पुत्र साहव सिंह, 7. सुरेश कुमार पुत्र महाताव सिंह, 8. विमल किशोर पुत्र महाताव सिंह, 9. रजत राणा पुत्र प्रदीप कुमार, 10. कुमारी शिवानी पुत्री प्रदीप कुमार सभी निवासी महाल पुड़वा, तहसील धीरा, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) की तामील नियमानुसार समन साधारण तरीके से करवाई जा चुकी है लेकिन रिपोर्ट तामील कुनिंदा अनुसार प्रतिवादी नं0 2 विनोद कुमार पुत्र प्रीतम चन्द का सही पता उपलब्ध करवाने में वादी प्रकाश चन्द ने असमर्थता जाहिर की है तथा इसकी तामील राजपत्र इश्तहार व मुनादी द्वारा करवाने हेतु प्रार्थना-पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है।

अतः उपरोक्त वर्णित प्रतिवादी को राजपत्र इश्तहार हि0प्र0/मुनादी के द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि वह उक्त तकसीम में अपना पक्ष रखना चाहते हैं तो वह दिनांक 07-08-2023 को प्रातः 10.30 बजे असालतन या वकालतन इस अदालत में हाजिर हों अन्यथा उनके खिलाफ एकतरफा कार्यवाई अमल में लाई जायेगी।

आज दिनांक 30-06-2023 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
तहसील धीरा, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

**ब अदालत तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, तहसील धीरा,
जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)**

केस नं0 : 08/Teh/2022

किस्म मुकद्दमा : तकसीम

तारीख पेशी : 07-08-2023

शीर्षक : प्रकाश चन्द आदि

बनाम

अनुरुद्ध कुमार आदि

Proclamation/Munadi U/s 23.

मुकद्दमा.—तकसीम जेर धारा 123 हि0 प्र0 भू-राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 बाबत भूमि खाता नं0 123, खतौनी नं0 173, खसरा नं0 228, रकबा तादादी 00-11-01 है0 स्थित महाल सनवाड़, मौजा पुढवा, तहसील धीरा, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

इस अदालत में प्रकाश चन्द पुत्र दुर्गा राम व संजूवाला पत्नी स्व0 प्रदीप कुमार आदि (वादीगण) ने जेर धारा 123 हि0 प्र0 भू-राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 के तहत उपरोक्त खाता की तकसीम किए जाने सम्बन्धी मुकद्दमा दायर किया है जिसमें प्रतिवादीगण 1. अनुरुद्ध कुमार पुत्र प्रीतम चन्द, 2. विनोद कुमार पुत्र प्रीतम चन्द, 3. सुजाता कुमारी पुत्री प्रीतम चन्द, 4. ओम प्रकाश पुत्र दुर्गा सिंह, 5. संजय कुमार पुत्र दुर्गा सिंह, सभी निवासी महाल पुड़वा, तहसील धीरा, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) की तामील नियमानुसार समन साधारण तरीके से करवाई जा चुकी है लेकिन रिपोर्ट तामील कुनिंदा अनुसार प्रतिवादी नं0 2 विनोद कुमार पुत्र प्रीतम चन्द का सही पता उपलब्ध करवाने में वादी प्रकाश चन्द ने असमर्थता जाहिर की है तथा इसकी तामील राजपत्र इश्तहार व मुनादी द्वारा करवाने हेतु प्रार्थना-पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है।

अतः उपरोक्त वर्णित प्रतिवादी को राजपत्र इश्तहार हि0प्र0/मुनादी के द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि वह उक्त तकसीम में अपना पक्ष रखना चाहते हैं तो वह दिनांक 07-08-2023 को प्रातः 10.30 बजे असालतन या वकालतन इस अदालत में हाजिर हों अन्यथा उसके खिलाफ एकतरफा कार्यवाई अमल में लाई जायेगी।

आज दिनांक 30-06-2023 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
तहसील धीरा, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नं0 :

तारीख पेशी : 09-08-2023

Rajinder Prasad, Ravinder Prasad, Surinder Kumar, Smt. Suman Lata all r/o Mohal Kunsal,
Tehsil Baijnath, Distt. Kangra (H.P.)

प्रार्थी।

बनाम

1. Satish Kumar, 2. Shakti Chand, 3. Shankuntla Devi, 4. Sanjay Kumar son, 5. Lalit,
6. Manju Devi, 7. Kusma Devi, 8. Tilak Raj, 9. Jatinder Kumar, 10. Piyush, 11. Priya, 12. Sunita,
13. Prem Dass, 14. Bri Singh, 15. Ramesh Chand all r/o Mohal Kunsal, Tehsil Baijnath, Distt.
Kangra (H.P.)

प्रतिवादीगण।

इशतहार अखबारी व मुस्त्री मुनादी।

विषय.—हि0 प्र0 भू-राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 की धारा 123 के अन्तर्गत भूमि खेवट नं0 72, खतौनी नं0 93,
खसरा नं0 169, रकबा तादादी 00-03-04 है0, वाक्या महाल Kunsal, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला
कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) जमाबन्दी वर्ष 2016-2017.

Rajinder Prasad, Ravinder Prasad, Surinder Kumar, Smt. Suman Lata all r/o Mohal Kunsal,
Mauja Baijnath, Tehsil Baijnath, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) ने इस कार्यालय में खाता नं0 72 का दावा भूमि
तकसीम दायर कर रखा है जिसमें उपरोक्त वर्णित प्रतिवादीगण 3, 5, 14, 15 को समन की तामील नहीं हो
पा रही है और न ही प्रार्थीगण को उनका सही पता मालूम न है प्रार्थीगण ने इनका सही पता प्राप्त होने बारा
अपनी असमर्थता जताई है। अतः न्यायालय की संतुष्टि व विश्वास हेतु यह सिद्ध हो गया है कि उक्त
प्रतिवादीगण की तामील साधारण ढंग से नहीं हो सकती है। अतः उक्त वर्णित प्रतिवादीगण को इस इशतहार
राजपत्र व मुस्त्री मुनादी चस्पांगी द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि वह उक्त मुकद्दमा की पैरवी हेतु असागतन
या वकालतन तारीख पेशी 09-08-2023 को हाजिर अदालत होकर पैरवी मुकद्दमा करें अन्यथा गैर-हाजिरी
की सूरत में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर आगामी आदेश पारित कर दिया जाएगा व बाद तारीख
पेशी किसी किस्म का उजर या एतराज स्वीकार्य न होगा।

यह इशतहार मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से आज दिनांक 31-05-2023 को जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—

सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नं0 :

तारीख पेशी : 09-08-2023

Rajinder Prasad, Ravinder Prasad, Surinder Kumar, Smt. Suman Lata all r/o Mohal Kunsal,
Tehsil Baijnath, Distt. Kangra (H.P.)

प्रार्थी।

बनाम

1. Satish Kumar, 2. Shakti Chand, 3. Shankuntla Devi, 4. Tilak Raj son, 5. Jatinder, 6. Piyush, 7. Priya, 8. Sunita, 9. Prem Dass, 10. Binari Lal, 11. Ramesh Chand, 12. Sarwan Kumar all r/o Mohal Kunsal, Tehsil Baijnath, Distt. Kangra (H.P.)

प्रतिवादीगण।

इशतहार अखबारी व मुस्त्री मुनादी।

विषय.—हि0 प्र0 भू-राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 की धारा 123 के अन्तर्गत भूमि खेवट नं0 73, खतौनी नं0 94, खसरा नं0 722/1621, रकबा तादादी 00-14-36 है0, वाक्या महाल Kunsal, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) जमाबन्दी वर्ष 2016-2017.

Rajinder Prasad, Ravinder Prasad, Surinder Kumar, Smt. Suman Lata all r/o Mohal Kunsal, Mauja Baijnath, Tehsil Baijnath, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) ने इस कार्यालय में खाता नं0 73 का दावा भूमि तकसीम दायर कर रखा है जिसमें उपरोक्त वर्णित प्रतिवादीगण 3, 10, 11, 12 को समन की तामील नहीं हो पा रही है और न ही प्रार्थीगण को उनका सही पता मालूम न है प्रार्थीगण ने इनका सही पता प्राप्त होने बारा अपनी असमर्थता जताई है। अतः न्यायालय की संतुष्टि व विश्वास हेतु यह सिद्ध हो गया है कि उक्त प्रतिवादीगण की तामील साधारण ढंग से नहीं हो सकती है। अतः उक्त वर्णित प्रतिवादीगण को इस इशतहार राजपत्र व मुस्त्री मुनादी चस्पांगी द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि वह उक्त मुकद्दमा की पैरवी हेतु असालतन या वकालतन तारीख पेशी 09-08-2023 को हाजिर अदालत होकर पैरवी मुकद्दमा करें अन्यथा गैर-हाजिरी की सूरत में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर आगामी आदेश पारित कर दिया जाएगा व बाद तारीख पेशी किसी किस्म का उजर या एतराज स्वीकार्य न होगा।

यह इशतहार मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से आज दिनांक 31-05-2023 को जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, शाहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मुकद्दमा : नाम दुरुस्ती।

पेशी : 16-08-2023

सुरेन्द्र कुमार पुत्र अमी चन्द, निवासी पोहाड़ा, तहसील शाहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.—दुरुस्ती नाम हि0 प्र0 रा0 अधिनियम, 1954 की जेर धारा 37(1) के तहत महाल योल में नाम दुरुस्ती बारे।

उपरोक्त मुकद्दमा बारे प्रार्थी ने इस न्यायालय में प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा है जिसमें लिखा है कि उसके पिता का सही नाम अमी चन्द पुत्र भागू पुत्र हौंसू है जबकि महाल योल के राजस्व अभिलेख में उक्त नाम फिहलो राम पुत्र भागू पुत्र हौंसू दर्ज है जोकि गलत इन्द्राज हुआ है। प्रार्थीगण उक्त महाल में उक्त नाम को सही करके फिहलो राम उपनाम अमी चन्द पुत्र भागू पुत्र हौंसू दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः उक्त प्रार्थना-पत्र के सन्दर्भ में उपरोक्त नाम की दुरुस्ती बारे यदि किसी को कोई एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन इस अदालत में दिनांक 16-08-2023 को दोपहर बाद 2.00 बजे हाजिर आ सकता है। हाजिर न आने की स्थिति में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर आगामी आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे और बाद में कोई भी उजर या एतराज जेरे समायत न होगा।

आज दिनांक 30-06-2023 को मेरी मोहर व हस्ताक्षर सहित जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
शाहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, शाहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मुकद्दमा : नाम दुरुस्ती।

पेशी : 17-08-2023

बसैरिया राम पुत्र घेपिया राम, निवासी चतरेरी, तहसील शाहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.—दुरुस्ती नाम हि0 प्र0 रा0 अधिनियम, 1954 की जेर धारा 37(1) के तहत महाल गन्धरप, चतरेरी व उपरला भन्यार में नाम दुरुस्ती बारे।

उपरोक्त मुकद्दमा बारे प्रार्थी ने इस न्यायालय में प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा है जिसमें लिखा है कि उसका सही नाम बसैरिया राम पुत्र घेपलिया पुत्र नुरध है जबकि महाल गन्धरप, चतरेरी व उपरला भन्यार के राजस्व अभिलेख में उक्त नाम बुशैहरी राम पुत्र घेपलिया पुत्र नुरध दर्ज है जोकि गलत इन्द्राज हुआ है। प्रार्थी उक्त महालात में उक्त नाम को सही करके बुशैहरी राम उपनाम बसैरिया राम पुत्र घेपलिया पुत्र नुरध दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः उक्त प्रार्थना-पत्र के सन्दर्भ में उपरोक्त नाम की दुरुस्ती बारे यदि किसी को कोई एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन इस अदालत में दिनांक 17-08-2023 को दोपहर बाद 2.00 बजे हाजिर आ सकता है। हाजिर न आने की स्थिति में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर आगामी आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे और बाद में कोई भी उजर या एतराज जेरे समायत न होगा।

आज दिनांक 30-06-2023 को मेरी मोहर व हस्ताक्षर सहित जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
शाहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, शाहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मुकद्दमा : नाम दुरुस्ती।

पेशी : 17-08-2023

प्रभात चन्द पुत्र अन्नत राम, निवासी सारनू, तहसील शाहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.—दुरुस्ती नाम हि० प्र० रा० अधिनियम, 1954 की जे० धारा 37(1) के तहत महाल मझार में नाम दुरुस्ती बारे।

उपरोक्त मुकद्दमा बारे प्रार्थी ने इस न्यायालय में प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा है जिसमें लिखा है कि उसका सही नाम प्रभात चन्द पुत्र अन्नत राम पुत्र सुर्जन है जबकि महाल मझार के राजस्व अभिलेख में उसका नाम प्रभात सिंह पुत्र अन्नत राम पुत्र सुर्जन दर्ज है जोकि गलत इन्द्राज हुआ है। प्रार्थीगण उक्त महाल में उक्त नाम को सही करके प्रभात सिंह उपनाम प्रभात चन्द पुत्र अन्नत राम पुत्र सुर्जन दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः उक्त प्रार्थना-पत्र के सन्दर्भ में उपरोक्त नाम की दुरुस्ती बारे यदि किसी को कोई एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन इस अदालत में दिनांक 17-08-2023 को दोपहर बाद 2.00 बजे हाजिर आ सकता है। हाजिर न आने की स्थिति में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर आगामी आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे और बाद में कोई भी उजर या एतराज जेरे समायत न होगा।

आज दिनांक 30-06-2023 को मेरी मोहर व हस्ताक्षर सहित जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
शाहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा (हि०प्र०)

मुकद्दमा नं० :

उनवान मिसल : नाम दुरुस्ती

श्रीमती कांता गगोटिया पत्नी सुनील कुमार सुपुत्र दौलत राम, गांव पंतेहड, डा० धिरथोली, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा (हि०प्र०)।

बनाम

आम जनता

सर्व जनता नगर पंचायत बैजनाथ पपरोला।

श्रीमती कांता गगोटिया पत्नी सुनील कुमार सुपुत्र दौलत राम, गांव पंतेहड, डा० धिरथोली, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा (हि०प्र०) ने एक आवेदन-पत्र मय शपथ-पत्र इस आशय के साथ गुजारा है कि उसके ससुर का नाम ग्राम पंचायत व अन्य दस्तावेजों में दौलत राम सुपुत्र मीनक दर्ज है जोकि उनका सही नाम है परन्तु राजस्व रिकार्ड में गलती से दौलत राम सुपुत्र मीनक के स्थान पर दूलो राम सुपुत्र मीनक, महाल पंतेहड में दर्ज हुआ है। अब राजस्व रिकार्ड में दौलत राम दर्ज करवाना चाहती है।

अतः इस इशतहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण जनता व हितबद्ध व्यक्तियों को सूचित किया जाता है कि उक्त नाम को दुरुस्त करने बारे किसी भी व्यक्ति को कोई भी आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 09-08-2023 या इससे पूर्व अधोहस्ताक्षरी के समक्ष असालतन या वकालतन उपस्थित होकर अपनी आपत्ति दर्ज कर सकता है। इसके पश्चात् कोई भी एतराज काबिले समायत नहीं होगा तथा आवेदन-पत्र पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 28-06-2023 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत श्री सतेन्द्र जीत, सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, तहसील नौहराधार,
जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)

श्री राजेश पुत्र श्री किरपा राम, निवासी ग्राम व डाकघर व तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

उपरोक्त प्रार्थना-पत्र श्री राजेश पुत्र श्री किरपा राम, निवासी ग्राम व डाकघर व तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) ने भू-राजस्व अधिनियम की धारा 37 के अन्तर्गत राजस्व अभिलेख में अपना नाम राजेन्द्र सिंह पुत्र किरपा राम के स्थान पर राजेश पुत्र श्री नीता राम दुरुस्त करवाने बारे आवेदन-पत्र प्रस्तुत कर प्रार्थना की है कि बाकी सभी दस्तावेजात में उसका नाम राजेश है जबकि राजस्व अभिलेख वाका मौजा नौहरा में उसका नाम राजेन्द्र सिंह गलत दर्ज है। प्रार्थी अपने अन्य दस्तावेजात के आधार पर राजस्व अभिलेख में अपना सही नाम राजेश दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस सम्बन्ध में यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उजर या एतराज हो तो वह स्वयं अथवा अपने प्रतिनिधि द्वारा मिति 02-08-2023 से पूर्व किसी भी कार्य दिवस में इस अदालत में उपस्थित आकर अपना लिखित एतराज प्रस्तुत करें बसूरत दीगर राजेश पुत्र श्री किरपा राम के नाम को दुरुस्त दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी कर दिये जावेंगे।

आज दिनांक 01-07-2023 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत श्री सतेन्द्र जीत, सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, तहसील नौहराधार,
जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)

श्री मोहिन्द्र सिंह पुत्र जालम सिंह, निवासी ग्राम कुफटू, डाकघर सेर तन्दूला, तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

उपरोक्त प्रार्थना-पत्र श्री मोहिन्द्र सिंह पुत्र जालम सिंह, निवासी ग्राम कुफटू, डाकघर सेर तन्दूला, तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) ने भू-राजस्व अधिनियम की धारा 37 के अन्तर्गत राजस्व अभिलेख में अपना नाम नागेन्द्र सिंह के स्थान पर राजेश पुत्र श्री मोहिन्द्र सिंह दुरुस्त करवाने बारे आवेदन-पत्र प्रस्तुत कर प्रार्थना की है कि बाकी सभी दस्तावेजात में उसका नाम मोहिन्द्र सिंह है जबकि राजस्व अभिलेख वाका मौजा कुफटू व मानल में उसका नाम नागेन्द्र सिंह गलत दर्ज है। प्रार्थी अपने अन्य दस्तावेजात के आधार पर राजस्व अभिलेख में अपना सही नाम मोहिन्द्र सिंह दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस सम्बन्ध में यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उजर या एतराज हो तो वह स्वयं अथवा अपने प्रतिनिधि द्वारा मिति 02-08-2023 से पूर्व किसी भी कार्य दिवस में इस अदालत में उपस्थित आकर अपना लिखित एतराज प्रस्तुत करें बसूरत दीगर मोहिन्द्र सिंह पुत्र जालम सिंह के नाम को दुरुस्त दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी कर दिये जावेंगे।

आज दिनांक 01-07-2023 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

**ब अदालत श्री सतेन्द्र जीत, सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, तहसील नौहराधार,
जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)**

श्री रवी कान्त पुत्र सुदर्शन सिंह, निवासी ग्राम निहोग, डाकघर सेर तन्दूला, तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

उपरोक्त प्रार्थना-पत्र श्री रवी कान्त पुत्र सुदर्शन सिंह, निवासी ग्राम निहोग, डाकघर सेर तन्दूला, तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) ने भू-राजस्व अधिनियम की धारा 37 के अन्तर्गत राजस्व अभिलेख में अपने पिता का नाम दर्शन सिंह के स्थान पर सुदर्शन सिंह दुरुस्त करवाने बारे आवेदन-पत्र प्रस्तुत कर प्रार्थना की है कि बाकी सभी दस्तावेजात में उसके पिता का नाम सुदर्शन सिंह है जबकि राजस्व अभिलेख वाका मौजा निहोग में उसके पिता का नाम दर्शन सिंह गलत दर्ज है। प्रार्थी अपने अन्य दस्तावेजात के आधार पर राजस्व अभिलेख में अपने पिता का सही नाम सुदर्शन सिंह दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस सम्बन्ध में यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उजर या एतराज हो तो वह स्वयं अथवा अपने प्रतिनिधि द्वारा मिति 02-08-2023 से पूर्व किसी भी कार्य दिवस में इस अदालत में उपस्थित आकर अपना लिखित एतराज प्रस्तुत करें बसूरत दीगर प्रार्थी के पिता का नाम सुदर्शन सिंह दुरुस्त दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी कर दिये जावेंगे।

आज दिनांक 01-07-2023 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

**ब अदालत श्री सतेन्द्र जीत, सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, तहसील नौहराधार,
जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)**

श्री सुन्दर सिंह पुत्र श्री जालम सिंह, निवासी ग्राम कुफटू, डाकघर सेर तन्दूला, तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

उपरोक्त प्रार्थना-पत्र श्री सुन्दर सिंह पुत्र श्री जालम सिंह, निवासी ग्राम कुफटू, डाकघर सेर तन्दूला, तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) ने भू-राजस्व अधिनियम की धारा 37 के अन्तर्गत राजस्व अभिलेख मौजा मानल में अपना नाम सुरेन्द्र सिंह के स्थान पर सुन्दर सिंह पुत्र श्री जालम सिंह दुरुस्त करवाने बारे आवेदन-पत्र प्रस्तुत कर प्रार्थना की है कि बाकी सभी दस्तावेजात में उसका नाम सुन्दर सिंह है जबकि राजस्व अभिलेख वाका मौजा मानल में उसका नाम सुरेन्द्र सिंह गलत दर्ज है। प्रार्थी अपने अन्य दस्तावेजात के आधार पर राजस्व अभिलेख में अपना सही नाम सुन्दर सिंह दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस सम्बन्ध में यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उजर या एतराज हो तो वह स्वयं अथवा अपने प्रतिनिधि द्वारा मिति 02-08-2023 से पूर्व किसी भी कार्य दिवस में इस अदालत में उपस्थित आकर अपना लिखित एतराज प्रस्तुत करें बसूरत दीगर वादी का सही नाम सुन्दर सिंह पुत्र श्री जालम सिंह के नाम को दुरुस्त दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी कर दिये जावेंगे।

आज दिनांक 01-07-2023 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

**ब अदालत श्री सतेन्द्र जीत, सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, तहसील नौहराधार,
जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)**

श्री सुशील पुत्र श्री सुरतिया, निवासी ग्राम व डाकघर लानाचेता, तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

उपरोक्त प्रार्थना-पत्र श्री सुशील पुत्र श्री सुरतिया, निवासी ग्राम व डाकघर लानाचेता, तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) ने भू-राजस्व अधिनियम की धारा 37 के अन्तर्गत राजस्व अभिलेख मौजा लानाचेता में अपना नाम कमल राज के स्थान पर सुशील पुत्र श्री सुरतिया दुरुस्त करवाने बारे आवेदन-पत्र प्रस्तुत कर प्रार्थना की है कि बाकी सभी दस्तावेजात में उसका नाम सुशील है जबकि राजस्व अभिलेख वाका मौजा लानाचेता में उसका नाम कमल राज गलत दर्ज है। प्रार्थी अपने अन्य दस्तावेजात के आधार पर राजस्व अभिलेख में अपना सही नाम सुशील दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस सम्बन्ध में यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उजर या एतराज हो तो वह स्वयं अथवा अपने प्रतिनिधि द्वारा मिति 02-08-2023 से पूर्व किसी भी कार्य

दिवस में इस अदालत में उपस्थित आकर अपना लिखित एतराज प्रस्तुत करें बसूरत दीगर वादी का सही नाम सुशील पुत्र सुरतिया के नाम को दुरुस्त दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी कर दिये जावेंगे।

आज दिनांक 01-07-2023 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत श्री सतेन्द्र जीत, सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, तहसील नौहराधार,
जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)

श्रीमती कान्ता पुत्री श्री गंगा राम, निवासी ग्राम चुनवी बोड़, डाकघर चाड़ना, तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

उपरोक्त प्रार्थना-पत्र श्रीमती कान्ता पुत्री श्री गंगा राम, निवासी ग्राम चुनवी बोड़, डाकघर चाड़ना, तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) ने भू-राजस्व अधिनियम की धारा 37 के अन्तर्गत राजस्व अभिलेख मौजा चुनवी बोड़ में अपने पिता का नाम रामभज के स्थान पर गंगा राम दुरुस्त करवाने बारे आवेदन-पत्र प्रस्तुत कर अनुरोध किया है कि बाकी सभी दस्तावेजात में उसके पिता का नाम गंगा राम है जबकि राजस्व अभिलेख वाका मौजा चुनवी बोड़ में उसके पिता का नाम रामभज गलत दर्ज है। प्रार्थी अपने अन्य दस्तावेजात के आधार पर राजस्व अभिलेख में अपने पिता का सही नाम गंगा राम दर्ज करवाना चाहती है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस सम्बन्ध में यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उजर या एतराज हो तो वह स्वयं अथवा अपने प्रतिनिधि द्वारा मिति 02-08-2023 से पूर्व किसी भी कार्य दिवस में इस अदालत में उपस्थित आकर अपना लिखित एतराज प्रस्तुत करें बसूरत दीगर वादिया के पिता का सही नाम गंगा राम दुरुस्त दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी कर दिये जावेंगे।

आज दिनांक 01-07-2023 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत श्री सतेन्द्र जीत, सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, तहसील नौहराधार,
जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)

श्री अरुण प्रकाश पुत्र श्री दलीप सिंह, निवासी ग्राम व डाकघर पुन्नरधार, तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

उपरोक्त प्रार्थना-पत्र श्री अरुण प्रकाश पुत्र श्री दलीप सिंह, निवासी ग्राम व डाकघर पुन्नरधार, तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) ने भू-राजस्व अधिनियम की धारा 37 के अन्तर्गत राजस्व अभिलेख मौजा पुन्नर में अपना नाम अजय कुमार के स्थान पर अरुण प्रकाश पुत्र श्री दलीप सिंह दुरुस्त करवाने बारे आवेदन-पत्र प्रस्तुत कर आग्रह किया है कि बाकी सभी दस्तावेजात में उसका नाम अरुण प्रकाश है जबकि राजस्व अभिलेख वाका मौजा पुन्नर में उसका नाम अजय कुमार गलत दर्ज है। प्रार्थी अपने अन्य दस्तावेजात के आधार पर राजस्व अभिलेख में अपना सही नाम अरुण प्रकाश दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस सम्बन्ध में यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उजर या एतराज हो तो वह स्वयं अथवा अपने प्रतिनिधि द्वारा मिति 02-08-2023 से पूर्व किसी भी कार्य दिवस में इस अदालत में उपस्थित आकर अपना लिखित एतराज प्रस्तुत करें बसूरत दीगर वादी का सही नाम अरुण प्रकाश पुत्र दलीप सिंह दुरुस्त दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी कर दिये जावेंगे।

आज दिनांक 01-07-2023 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत श्री सतेन्द्र जीत, सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, तहसील नौहराधार,
जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)

श्री विजेन्द्र सिंह पुत्र श्री सूरत राम, निवासी ग्राम भंगाड़ी, डाकघर चोकर, तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

उपरोक्त प्रार्थना-पत्र श्री विजेन्द्र सिंह पुत्र श्री सूरत राम, निवासी ग्राम भंगाड़ी, डाकघर चोकर, तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) ने भू-राजस्व अधिनियम की धारा 37 के अन्तर्गत राजस्व अभिलेख मौजा चोकर में अपना नाम विरेन्द्र सिंह के स्थान पर विजेन्द्र सिंह पुत्र श्री सूरत राम दुरुस्त करवाने बारे आवेदन-पत्र प्रस्तुत कर आग्रह किया है कि बाकी सभी दस्तावेजात में उसका नाम विजेन्द्र सिंह है जबकि राजस्व अभिलेख वाका मौजा चोकर में उसका नाम विरेन्द्र सिंह गलत दर्ज है। प्रार्थी अपने अन्य दस्तावेजात के आधार पर राजस्व अभिलेख में अपना सही नाम विजेन्द्र सिंह दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस सम्बन्ध में यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उजर या एतराज हो तो वह स्वयं अथवा अपने प्रतिनिधि द्वारा मिति 02-08-2023 से पूर्व किसी भी कार्य दिवस में इस अदालत में उपस्थित आकर अपना लिखित एतराज प्रस्तुत करें बसूरत दीगर वादी का सही नाम विजेन्द्र सिंह पुत्र श्री सूरत राम दुरुस्त दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी कर दिये जावेंगे।

आज दिनांक 01-07-2023 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

**ब अदालत श्री सतेन्द्र जीत, सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, तहसील नौहराधार,
जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)**

श्री भारत भूषण पुत्र श्री ख्यालू, निवासी ग्राम व डाकघर सिऊं, तहसील श्री रेणुका जी स्थित संगड़ाह, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

उपरोक्त प्रार्थना-पत्र श्री भारत भूषण पुत्र श्री ख्यालू, निवासी ग्राम व डाकघर सिऊं, तहसील श्री रेणुका जी स्थित संगड़ाह, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) ने भू-राजस्व अधिनियम की धारा 37 के अन्तर्गत राजस्व अभिलेख मौजा नौहरा में अपना नाम भरत सिंह के स्थान पर भारत भूषण पुत्र श्री ख्यालू दुरुस्त करवाने बारे आवेदन-पत्र प्रस्तुत कर आग्रह किया है कि बाकी सभी दस्तावेजात में उसका नाम भारत भूषण है जबकि राजस्व अभिलेख वाका मौजा नौहरा में उसका नाम भरत सिंह गलत दर्ज है। प्रार्थी अपने अन्य दस्तावेजात के आधार पर राजस्व अभिलेख में अपना सही नाम भारत भूषण दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस सम्बन्ध में यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उजर या एतराज हो तो वह स्वयं अथवा अपने प्रतिनिधि द्वारा मिति 02-08-2023 से पूर्व किसी भी कार्य दिवस में इस अदालत में उपस्थित आकर अपना लिखित एतराज प्रस्तुत करें बसूरत दीगर वादी का सही नाम भारत भूषण पुत्र श्री ख्यालू दुरुस्त दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी कर दिये जावेंगे।

आज दिनांक 01-07-2023 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

**ब अदालत श्री सतेन्द्र जीत, सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, तहसील नौहराधार,
जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)**

श्री भीन्दर सिंह पुत्र श्री मोही राम, निवासी ग्राम गतलोग, डाकघर भुजोण्ड, तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

उपरोक्त प्रार्थना-पत्र भीन्दर सिंह पुत्र श्री मोही राम, निवासी ग्राम गतलोग, डाकघर भुजोण्ड, तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) ने भू-राजस्व अधिनियम की धारा 37 के अन्तर्गत राजस्व अभिलेख मौजा गतलोग में अपना नाम महिन्द्र सिंह के स्थान पर भीन्दर सिंह पुत्र श्री मोही राम दुरुस्त करवाने बारे आवेदन-पत्र प्रस्तुत कर आग्रह किया है कि बाकी सभी दस्तावेजात में उसका नाम भीन्दर सिंह है जबकि राजस्व अभिलेख वाका मौजा गतलोग में उसका नाम महिन्द्र सिंह गलत दर्ज है। प्रार्थी अपने अन्य दस्तावेजात के आधार पर राजस्व अभिलेख में अपना सही नाम भीन्दर सिंह दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस सम्बन्ध में यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उजर या एतराज हो तो वह स्वयं अथवा अपने प्रतिनिधि द्वारा मिति 02-08-2023 से पूर्व किसी भी कार्य

दिवस में इस अदालत में उपस्थित आकर अपना लिखित एतराज प्रस्तुत करें बसूरत दीगर वादी का सही नाम भीन्दर सिंह पुत्र श्री मोही राम दुरुस्त दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी कर दिये जावेंगे।

आज दिनांक 01-07-2023 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत श्री सतेन्द्र जीत, सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, तहसील नौहराधार,
जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)

श्री सुभाष पुत्र श्री नैत्र सिंह, निवासी ग्राम व डाकघर भुजोण्ड, तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

उपरोक्त प्रार्थना-पत्र सुभाष पुत्र श्री नैत्र सिंह, निवासी ग्राम व डाकघर भुजोण्ड, तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) ने भू-राजस्व अधिनियम की धारा 37 के अन्तर्गत राजस्व अभिलेख मौजा भुजोण्ड में अपना नाम भूपाल के स्थान पर सुभाष पुत्र श्री नैत्र सिंह दुरुस्त करवाने बारे आवेदन-पत्र प्रस्तुत कर आग्रह किया है कि बाकी सभी दस्तावेजात में उसका नाम सुभाष है जबकि राजस्व अभिलेख वाका मौजा भुजोण्ड में उसका नाम भूपाल गलत दर्ज है। प्रार्थी अपने अन्य दस्तावेजात के आधार पर राजस्व अभिलेख में अपना सही नाम सुभाष दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस सम्बन्ध में यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उजर या एतराज हो तो वह स्वयं अथवा अपने प्रतिनिधि द्वारा मिति 02-08-2023 से पूर्व किसी भी कार्य दिवस में इस अदालत में उपस्थित आकर अपना लिखित एतराज प्रस्तुत करें बसूरत दीगर वादी का सही नाम सुभाष पुत्र नैत्र सिंह दुरुस्त दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी कर दिये जावेंगे।

आज दिनांक 01-07-2023 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत श्री सतेन्द्र जीत, सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, तहसील नौहराधार,
जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)

श्री राजेश कुमार पुत्र श्री भादर सिंह, निवासी ग्राम भाटण, डाकघर भुजोण्ड, तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

उपरोक्त प्रार्थना-पत्र श्री राजेश कुमार पुत्र श्री भादर सिंह, निवासी ग्राम भाटण, डाकघर भुजोण्ड, तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) ने भू-राजस्व अधिनियम की धारा 37 के अन्तर्गत राजस्व अभिलेख मौजा भुजोण्ड में अपना नाम राकेश के स्थान पर राजेश पुत्र श्री भादर सिंह दुरुस्त करवाने बारे आवेदन-पत्र प्रस्तुत कर आग्रह किया है कि बाकी सभी दस्तावेजात में उसका नाम राजेश कुमार है जबकि राजस्व अभिलेख वाका मौजा भुजोण्ड में उसका नाम राकेश गलत दर्ज है। प्रार्थी अपने अन्य दस्तावेजात के आधार पर राजस्व अभिलेख में अपना सही नाम राजेश कुमार दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस सम्बन्ध में यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उजर या एतराज हो तो वह स्वयं अथवा अपने प्रतिनिधि द्वारा मिति 02-08-2023 से पूर्व किसी भी कार्य दिवस में इस अदालत में उपस्थित आकर अपना लिखित एतराज प्रस्तुत करें बसूरत दीगर वादी का सही नाम राजेश कुमार पुत्र श्री भादर सिंह दुरुस्त दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी कर दिये जावेंगे।

आज दिनांक 01-07-2023 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

**ब अदालत श्री सतेन्द्र जीत, सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, तहसील नौहराधार,
जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)**

श्री जीत सिंह पुत्र श्री मीना, निवासी ग्राम व डाकघर चाड़ना, तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

उपरोक्त प्रार्थना-पत्र श्री जीत सिंह पुत्र श्री मीना, निवासी ग्राम व डाकघर चाड़ना, तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) ने भू-राजस्व अधिनियम की धारा 37 के अन्तर्गत राजस्व अभिलेख मौजा चाड़ना में अपना नाम जितु के स्थान पर जीत सिंह पुत्र श्री मीना दुरुस्त करवाने बारे आवेदन-पत्र प्रस्तुत कर आग्रह किया है कि बाकी सभी दस्तावेजात में उसका नाम जीत सिंह है जबकि राजस्व अभिलेख वाका मौजा चाड़ना में उसका नाम जितु गलत दर्ज है। प्रार्थी अपने अन्य दस्तावेजात के आधार पर राजस्व अभिलेख में अपना सही नाम जीत सिंह दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस सम्बन्ध में यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उजर या एतराज हो तो वह स्वयं अथवा अपने प्रतिनिधि द्वारा मिति 02-08-2023 से पूर्व किसी भी कार्य दिवस में इस अदालत में उपस्थित आकर अपना लिखित एतराज प्रस्तुत करें बसूरत दीगर वादी का सही नाम जीत सिंह पुत्र श्री मीना दुरुस्त दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी कर दिये जावेंगे।

आज दिनांक 01-07-2023 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
तहसील नौहराधार, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

In the Court of Sub-Divisional Magistrate Rajgarh, District Sirmaur, Himachal Pradesh

Sachit Sood s/o Sh. Kulbhushan Sood, r/o Ward No. 7, N.P. Rajgarh, P.O. & Tehsil Rajgarh, District Sirmaur, Himachal Pradesh.

and

Ridhima Sood d/o Sh. Yash Pal Sood, r/o Ward No.4, N.P. Rajgarh, P.O. & Tehsil Rajgarh, District Sirmaur, Himachal Pradesh.

Versus

General Public

Whereas, Sh. Sachit Sood s/o Sh. Kulbhushan Sood, r/o Ward No. 7, N.P. Rajgarh, P.O. & Tehsil Rajgarh, District Sirmaur, Himachal Pradesh has preferred an application supported by his & his wife's affidavits stating therein that he had solemnized his marriage with Smt. Ridhima Sood d/o Sh. Yash Pal Sood, r/o Ward No.4, N.P. Rajgarh, P.O. & Tehsil Rajgarh, District Sirmaur, Himachal Pradesh as per hindu rites & customs at the Radha Krishan Mandir Rajgarh, on 11-05-2022 in the presence of his relatives. He has requested to get registered his marriage in the record of Nagar Panchayat Rajgarh, Tehsil Rajgarh, District Sirmaur, Himachal Pradesh.

Notices are given to all concerned and general public to this effect if anybody has got any objection regarding the registration of marriage duly solemnized between above said Sachit Sood aged about 32 years s/o Sh. Kulbhushan Sood, r/o Ward No. 7, N.P. Rajgarh, P.O. & Tehsil Rajgarh, District Sirmaur, Himachal Pradesh and Smt. Ridhima Sood aged about 31 years d/o Sh. Yash Pal Sood, r/o Ward No.4, N.P. Rajgarh, P.O. & Tehsil Rajgarh, District Sirmaur, Himachal Pradesh, they should file their written objections and should appear personally or through their authorized agents before me on or before 04-08-2023, failing which it will be presumed that nobody has any objection and necessary orders will be issued to the concerned Nagar Panchayat for registration in the marriage register.

Given under my hand and seal of the court today on 05-07-2023.

Seal.

Sd/-
Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Rajgarh, District Sirmaur (H.P.).

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी (नायब तहसीलदार), नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)

श्री चन्दर मोहन पुत्र श्री बाला दत्त, निवासी ग्राम खरक, डाकघर जमटा, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादीगण।

आवेदन—पत्र बाबत नाम दुरुस्ती मौजा मण्डलाह, तहसील नाहन बारे।

प्रार्थी श्री चन्दर मोहन पुत्र श्री बाला दत्त, निवासी ग्राम खरक, डाकघर जमटा, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) ने इस अदालत में दरखास्त पेश की है कि राजस्व रिकार्ड मोहाल मण्डलाह, तहसील नाहन में उसकी बुआ का नाम श्रीमती पार्वती देवी पुत्री श्री राम दर्ज है जोकि गलत है जिसे दुरुस्त किया जाए।

अतः इस इशतहार द्वारा आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी भी व्यक्ति को प्रार्थी की बुआ का नाम मौजा मण्डलाह में श्रीमती पार्वती देवी के स्थान पर श्रीमती पार्वती देवी उर्फ श्रीमती सुमित्रा देवी दर्ज करने बारे कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह अपना एतराज दिनांक 05-08-2023 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे तक इस अदालत हजा में असालतन/वकालतन हाजिर आकर पेश कर सकते हैं। हाजिर न आने की सूरत में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जावेगी। उसके बाद किसी का कोई भी उजर/एतराज जेर समायत न होगा।

आज दिनांक 28-06-2023 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर सहित अदालत से जारी हुआ है।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी एवं नायब तहसीलदार,
नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी (तहसीलदार), नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि0 प्र0)

श्री साधू राम पुत्र स्व0 श्री आत्मा राम, निवासी मालोवाला, डा0 शम्भूवाला, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थी श्री साधू राम पुत्र स्व0 श्री आत्मा राम, निवासी मालोवाला, डा0 शम्भूवाला, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) ने अधीन धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के अन्तर्गत प्रस्तुत करके आवेदन किया है कि उसकी जन्म तिथि 03-05-1949 है, जो ग्राम पंचायत बनकला, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) में दर्ज नहीं है। जिसे प्रार्थी अब दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस सम्बन्ध में यदि किसी व्यक्ति को कोई उजर या एतराज हो तो वह स्वयं अथवा अपने प्रतिनिधि द्वारा दिनांक 10-08-2023 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे अदालत में हाजिर होकर अपना एतराज प्रस्तुत कर सकता है। अगर उक्त तारीख तक किसी का उजर/एतराज प्राप्त नहीं होता तो उक्त श्री साधू राम की जन्म तिथि 03-05-1949 ग्राम पंचायत बनकला, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) में दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी कर दिये जावेंगे।

आज दिनांक 21-06-2023 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी (तहसीलदार),
नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी (तहसीलदार), नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि0 प्र0)

श्रीमती दयावन्ती पुत्री श्री करतार सिंह, निवासी देवनी-डेहला, डा0 मोनोगीन्द, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थिया श्रीमती दयावन्ती पुत्री श्री करतार सिंह, निवासी देवनी-डेहला, डा0 मोनोगीन्द, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) ने अधीन धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के अन्तर्गत प्रस्तुत करके आवेदन किया है कि उसकी जन्म तिथि 05-01-1970 है, जोकि ग्राम पंचायत पालियों, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) में दर्ज नहीं है। जिसे प्रार्थिया अब दर्ज करवाना चाहती है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस सम्बन्ध में यदि किसी व्यक्ति को कोई उजर या एतराज हो तो वह स्वयं अथवा अपने प्रतिनिधि द्वारा दिनांक 16-08-2023 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे अदालत में हाजिर होकर अपना एतराज प्रस्तुत कर सकता है। अगर उक्त तारीख तक किसी का उजर/एतराज प्राप्त नहीं होता तो उक्त श्रीमती दयावन्ती की जन्म तिथि 05-01-1970 ग्राम पंचायत पालियों, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) में दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी कर दिये जावेंगे।

आज दिनांक 23-06-2023 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—

कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी (तहसीलदार),
नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी (तहसीलदार), नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि0 प्र0)

श्रीमती शीला देवी पुत्री स्व0 श्री जगत सिंह, निवासी कठाना, डा0 सुरला, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थिया श्रीमती शीला देवी पुत्री स्व0 श्री जगत सिंह, निवासी कठाना, डा0 सुरला, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) ने अधीन धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के अन्तर्गत प्रस्तुत करके आवेदन किया है कि उसकी जन्म तिथि 13-08-1960 है, जोकि ग्राम पंचायत देवका पुडली, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) में दर्ज नहीं है। जिसे प्रार्थिया अब दर्ज करवाना चाहती है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस सम्बन्ध में यदि किसी व्यक्ति को कोई उजर या एतराज हो तो वह स्वयं अथवा अपने प्रतिनिधि द्वारा दिनांक 10-08-2023 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे अदालत में हाजिर होकर अपना एतराज प्रस्तुत कर सकता है। अगर उक्त तारीख तक किसी का उजर/एतराज प्राप्त नहीं होता तो उक्त श्रीमती शीला देवी की जन्म तिथि 13-08-1960 ग्राम पंचायत बनकला, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) में दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी कर दिये जावेंगे।

आज दिनांक 21-06-2023 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—

कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी (तहसीलदार),
नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

**In the Court of Sh. Multan Singh Banyal, Executive Magistrate (Tehsildar) Solan,
District Solan, Himachal Pradesh**

In the matter of :

Sh. Raj Kamal s/o Shri Tilak Raj Sharma, r/o H. No. 1205/6, Mohalla Amarpur Nahan,
Distt. Sirmaur (H.P.) . . Applicant.

Versus

General Public . . Respondent.

Application under section 13(3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969.

Sh. Raj Kamal s/o Shri Tilak Raj Sharma, r/o H. No. 1205/6, Mohalla Amarpur Nahan, Distt. Sirmaur has moved an application before the undersigned under section 13(3) of Birth & Death Registration Act, 1969 alongwith affidavit and other documents for entering of date of birth of his son namely—Bhawan Gautam *i.e.* 08-12-2004 at Malan Nursing Home Solan. Palace Road Solan, Tehsil & Distt. Solan but his date of birth could not be entered in the record of Municipal Corporation Solan, Tehsil & District Solan.

Therefore, by this proclamation, the general public is hereby informed that any person having any objection(s) for the registration of delayed date of birth of Shri Bhawan Gautam s/o Shri Raj Kamal, r/o H. No. 1205/6, Mohalla Amarpur Nahan, Distt. Sirmaur (H.P.) may submit their objection in writing or appear in person in this court on or before 03-08-2023 at 10.00 A.M. failing which no objection will be entertained after expiry of date.

Given under my hand and seal of the court on this 4th day of July, 2023.

Seal.

Sd/-
(MULTAN SINGH BANYAL),
Executive Magistrate (Tehsildar),
Solan, District Solan (H.P.).

**In the Court of Sh. Multan Singh Banyal, Executive Magistrate (Tehsildar) Solan,
District Solan, Himachal Pradesh**

In the matter of :

Smt. Ritu Shah w/o Shri Prem Shah, r/o Village Shattal, P.O. Deothi, Tehsil & District Solan (H.P.) . . Applicant.

Versus

General Public . . Respondent.

Application under section 13(3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969.

Smt. Ritu Shah w/o Shri Prem Shah, r/o Village Shattal, P.O. Deothi, Tehsil & District Solan has moved an application before the undersigned under section 13(3) of Birth & Death Registration Act, 1969 alongwith affidavit and other documents for entering of date of birth of her daughter namely—Niharika *i.e.* 23-11-2019 at Village Shattal, P.O. Deothi, Tehsil & Distt. Solan but her date of birth could not be entered in the record of Gram Panchayat Deothi, Tehsil & District Solan.

Therefore, by this proclamation, the general public is hereby informed that any person having any objection(s) for the registration of delayed date of birth of Niharika d/o Shri Prem Shah, r/o Village Shattal, P.O. Deothi, Tehsil & Distt. Solan (H.P.) may submit their objection in writing or appear in person in this court on or before 03-08-2023 at 10.00 A.M. failing which no objection will be entertained after expiry of date.

Given under my hand and seal of the court on this 4th day of July, 2023.

Seal.

Sd/-
(MULTAN SINGH BANYAL),
*Executive Magistrate (Tehsildar),
Solan, District Solan (H.P.).*

**In the Court of Sh. Multan Singh Banyal, Executive Magistrate (Tehsildar) Solan,
District Solan, Himachal Pradesh**

In the matter of :

Shri Desh Raj Koundal, s/o Shri Bidhi Chand, r/o Village Jabal Jamrot, P.O. Koti, Tehsil & District Solan (H.P.)
.. Applicant.

Versus

General Public
.. Respondent.

Application under section 13(3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969.

Sh. Desh Raj Koundal, s/o Shri Bidhi Chand, r/o Village Jabal Jamrot, P.O. Koti, Tehsil & District Solan has moved an application before the undersigned under section 13(3) of Birth & Death Registration Act, 1969 alongwith affidavit and other documents for entering of date of birth of his son namely—Ayush Koundal *i.e.* 23-10-1998 at Village Jabal Jamrot, P.O. Koti, Tehsil & Distt. Solan but his date of birth could not be entered in the record of Gram Panchayat Jabal Jamrot, Tehsil & District Solan.

Therefore, by this proclamation, the general public is hereby informed that any person having any objection(s) for the registration of delayed date of birth of Ayush Koundal s/o Shri Desh Raj Koundal, r/o Jabal Jamrot, P.O. Koti, Tehsil & Distt. Solan (H.P.) may submit their objection in writing or appear in person in this court on or before 03-08-2023 at 10.00 A.M. failing which no objection will be entertained after expiry of date.

Given under my hand and seal of the court on this 4th day of July, 2023.

Seal.

Sd/-
(MULTAN SINGH BANYAL),
Executive Magistrate (Tehsildar),
Solan, District Solan (H.P.).

**In the Court of Sh. Multan Singh Banyal, Executive Magistrate (Tehsildar) Solan,
District Solan, Himachal Pradesh**

In the matter of :

Sh. Desh Raj Koundal, s/o Shri Bidhi Chand, r/o Village Jabal Jamrot, P.O. Koti, Tehsil &
District Solan (H.P.) . . Applicant.

Versus

General Public

. . Respondent.

Application under section 13(3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969.

Shri Desh Raj Koundal, s/o Shri Bidhi Chand, r/o Village Jabal Jamrot, P.O. Koti, Tehsil & District Solan has moved an application before the undersigned under section 13(3) of Birth & Death Registration Act, 1969 alongwith affidavit and other documents for entering of date of birth of his daughter namely—Shweta Kumari Koundal *i.e.* 28-04-1988 at Village Jabal Jamrot, P.O. Koti, Tehsil & Distt. Solan but her date of birth could not be entered in the record of Gram Panchayat Jabal Jamrot, Tehsil & District Solan.

Therefore, by this proclamation, the general public is hereby informed that any person having any objection(s) for the registration of delayed date of birth of Shweta Kumari Koundal d/o Shri Desh Raj Koundal, r/o Jabal Jamrot, P.O. Koti, Tehsil & Distt. Solan (H.P.) may submit their objection in writing or appear in person in this court on or before 03-08-2023 at 10.00 A.M. failing which no objection will be entertained after expiry of date.

Given under my hand and seal of the court on this 4th day of July, 2023.

Seal.

Sd/-
(MULTAN SINGH BANYAL),
Executive Magistrate (Tehsildar),
Solan, District Solan (H.P.).

**In the Court of Sh. Multan Singh Banyal, Executive Magistrate (Tehsildar) Solan,
District Solan, Himachal Pradesh**

In the matter of :

Shri Desh Raj Koundal, s/o Shri Bidhi Chand, r/o Village Jabal Jamrot, P.O. Koti, Tehsil & District Solan (H.P.) . . Applicant.

Versus

General Public

. . Respondent.

Application under section 13(3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969.

Sh. Desh Raj Koundal, s/o Shri Bidhi Chand, r/o Village Jabal Jamrot, P.O. Koti, Tehsil & District Solan has moved an application before the undersigned under section 13(3) of Birth & Death Registration Act, 1969 alongwith affidavit and other documents for entering of date of birth of his daughter namely—Shreya Kumari *i.e.* 25-02-1992 at Village Jabal Jamrot, P.O. Koti, Tehsil & Distt. Solan but her date of birth could not be entered in the record of Gram Panchayat Jabal Jamrot, Tehsil & District Solan.

Therefore, by this proclamation, the general public is hereby informed that any person having any objection(s) for the registration of delayed date of birth of Shreya Kumari d/o Shri Desh Raj Koundal, r/o Jabal Jamrot, P.O. Koti, Tehsil & Distt. Solan (H.P.) may submit their objection in writing or appear in person in this court on or before 03-08-2023 at 10.00 A.M. failing which no objection will be entertained after expiry of date.

Given under my hand and seal of the court on this 4th day of July, 2023.

Seal.

Sd/-
(MULTAN SINGH BANYAL),
Executive Magistrate (Tehsildar),
Solan, District Solan (H.P.).

**In the Court of Sh. Multan Singh Banyal, Executive Magistrate (Tehsildar) Solan,
District Solan, Himachal Pradesh**

In the matter of :

Smt. Sima Devi w/o Shri Suman Pandit, r/o Ward No. 13, Kaleen Solan, Tehsil & District Solan (H.P.) . . Applicant.

Versus

General Public

. . Respondent.

Application under section 13(3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969.

Whereas, Smt. Sima Devi w/o Shri Suman Pandit, r/o Ward No. 13, Kaleen Solan, Tehsil & District Solan (H.P.) has moved an application before the undersigned under section 13(3) of Birth & Death Registration Act, 1969 and section 9(3) of H.P. Birth & Death Registration Rule, 2003 alongwith affidavit and other relevant documents for entering of date of birth of her son Gaurav s/o Shri Suman Pandit and Smt. Sima Devi *i.e.* 06-09-2015 at place of birth is r/o Ward No. 13, Kaleen-Solan, Tehsil & Distt. Solan (H.P.) but his date of birth could not be entered in the record of Municipal Corporation Solan, Tehsil & District Solan, (H.P.).

Now therefore, by this proclamation, the general public is hereby informed that any person having any objection(s) for the registration of delayed date of birth of Gaurav s/o Shri Suman Pandit and Smt. Sima Devi, Ward No. 13, Kaleen-Solan, Tehsil & Distt. Solan (H.P.) may submit their objections in writing or appear in person in this court on or before 11-08-2023 at 10.00 A.M. failing which no objection will be entertained after expiry of date.

Given under my hand and seal of the court on this 11th day of July, 2023.

Seal.

Sd/-
(MULTAN SINGH BANYAL),
Executive Magistrate (Tehsildar),
Solan, District Solan (H.P.).

**In the Court of Sh. Multan Singh Banyal, Executive Magistrate (Tehsildar) Solan,
District Solan, Himachal Pradesh**

In the matter of :

Shri Desh Raj Koundal, s/o Shri Bidhi Chand, r/o Village Jabal Jamrot, P.O. Koti, Tehsil &
District Solan (H.P.) . . Applicant.

Versus

General Public . . Respondent.

Application under section 13(3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969.

Sh. Desh Raj Koundal, s/o Shri Bidhi Chand, r/o Village Jabal Jamrot, P.O. Koti, Tehsil & District Solan has moved an application before the undersigned under section 13(3) of Birth & Death Registration Act, 1969 alongwith affidavit and other documents for entering of date of birth of his son namely—Piyush Koundal *i.e.* 23-10-1998 at Village Jabal Jamrot, P.O. Koti, Tehsil & Distt. Solan but his date of birth could not be entered in the record of Gram Panchayat Jabal Jamrot, Tehsil & District Solan.

Therefore, by this proclamation, the general public is hereby informed that any person having any objection(s) for the registration of delayed date of birth of Piyush Koundal s/o Shri Desh Raj Koundal, r/o Jabal Jamrot, P.O. Koti, Tehsil & Distt. Solan (H.P.) may submit their objection in writing or appear in person in this court on or before 03-08-2023 at 10.00 A.M. failing which no objection will be entertained after expiry of date.

Given under my hand and seal of the court on this 4th day of July, 2023.

Seal.

Sd/-
(MULTAN SINGH BANYAL),
Executive Magistrate (Tehsildar),
Solan, District Solan (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Sanjay Kumari d/o Sh. Balak Ram, r/o Village Kanger Banona, P.O. Wasni, Tehsil Pachhad, Distt. Sirmaur (H.P.) declare that I have changed my name from Sanjay Kumari to Shivanshi Bhandari. In future I will be known as Shivanshi Bhandari. All concerned please may note.

SANJAY KUMARI
d/o Sh. Balak Ram,
r/o Village Kanger Banona, P.O. Wasni,
Tehsil Pachhad, Distt. Sirmaur (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Anshika Choudhary d/o Ram Prasad aged 24 years, residing at V.P.O. Sathana, Tehsil Fatehpur, Distt. Kanga (H.P.) India 176025 changed my name from Anshika to Anshika Choudhary vide affidavit number 3991 dated 13-07-2023 sworn before Executive Magistrate.

ANSHIKA CHOUDHARY
d/o Ram Prasad,
residing at V.P.O. Sathana,
Tehsil Fatehpur, Distt. Kanga (H.P.) .

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Guddi Devi d/o Nagender, r/o V. & P.O. Mangoo, Tehsil Arki, Distt. Solan (H.P.) have changed my name from Guddi Devi to Garima for all future purposes.

GUDDI DEVI
d/o Nagender,
r/o V. & P.O. Mangoo,
Tehsil Arki, Distt. Solan (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Kuldeep Singh s/o Sh. Sher Singh, r/o Village Upper Banooti, P.O. Rouri, Tehsil & Distt. Shimla (H.P.) have changed my name to Kuldeep Singh Thakur s/o Sh. Sher Singh Thakur vide affidavit No. 19AA 555054, dated 21-06-2023 sworn before Executive Magistrate, Tehsil Shimla (U) for all future purposes.

KULDEEP SINGH
s/o Sh. Sher Singh,
r/o Village Upper Banooti, P.O. Rouri,
Tehsil & Distt. Shimla (H.P.).

